National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. Without Concealment....Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. XI....NO. 19. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1850. WHOLE NO. 539.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.
TERMS: TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Pro-Slavery.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE BILL.

SPEECH OF HON. T. G. PRATT,

OF MARYLAND

In the United States Senate, August 20 and 21, 1850.

The Senate having under consideration the bill to provide for the more effectual execution of the third clause of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. Pratt moved to amend the bill as, amended, by adding several sections thereto, as follows:

Sec. —. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever a person held to service or labor, as are hereinbefore expressed, shall escape as aforesaid; it shall, and may be, lawful for the person or persons to whom such service or labor is due, or his, her or their agent or attorney, authorized in the manner prescribed by the third section of this act to deliver to the proper officer authorized by this act, to hear and determine upon the claim of such person or persons to the service or labor of such fugitive, a transcript of the record as authorized by the —— section of this act, and authenticated as thereby required, or such other proof as such claimants would now by law be authorized to furnish; and thereupon, and upon the affidavit in writing of such claimant, or of his, her, or their agent or attorney, made before such officer, that the person or persons named in said record as a fugitive or fugitives, is or are, at the time of such affidavit being made, within the county where such officer resides, or within the territorial limits within which such officer is authorized to act, it shall be the duty of such officer forthwith to issue his warrant, directed as is aforesaid provided, and upon the receipt thereof by the officer to whom directed, it shall be his duty to execute the same, and to proceed therewith in the same manner as is prescribed by the third section of this act.

Sec. —. *And be it further enacted*, That if such fugitive be not delivered up to the person or persons delivering such transcript, or furnishing such other proof as aforesaid, within —— days after the same is delivered or furnished, and affidavit made as aforesaid, then it shall be lawful for such claimant or claimants to institute suit in the circuit or district court of the United States, in which he, she, or they reside, against the district attorney of the United States for such district, to recover the value of such fugitive from service or labor and the legal expenses incurred in the attempt to secure such fugitive.

Sec. —. *And be it further enacted*, That at the time of instituting such suit in the circuit or district court as aforesaid, the said claimant shall file a declaration in writing, in which he shall set forth his title to the service or labor of such fugitive; the proceedings had, to be under the provisions of this act to recover such fugitive in the State or Territory into which such fugitive has escaped; that the said fugitive was in the county named in said proceedings when the same was there commenced, and that such fugitive had not been delivered to said claimant as required by this act; that a copy of said declaration shall be issued by the clerk of said district or circuit court, with a summons against the said district attorney, which shall be delivered to the marshal of the United States, to be by him served on the said attorney, and then returned as in the case of other mesne process to said court.

Sec. —. *And be it further enacted*, That at the term of said court to which the said process shall be returned served, it shall be the duty of the said attorney to take issue to the said declaration, whereupon it shall be the duty of said court to swear a jury to try said issues; the said attorney being hereby required to defend the same on behalf of the United States, and upon the verdict of the jury in favor of such claimant to be rendered upon such legal and competent testimony as shall be admitted by the court, judgment shall be rendered in said court for the value of the service or labor of such fugitive, as ascertained by the jury, together with the legal expenses incurred by the said claimant in the prosecution of his said claim.

Sec. —. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall and may be lawful for any claimant who may recover judgment as aforesaid, to make an authenticated copy thereof, and to present the same to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay the same out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. —. *And be it further enacted*, That if, at any time after any fugitive from service or labor shall be paid for as hereinbefore authorized and required, it shall be in the power of the officers named in this act to apprehend such fugitive, it shall be the duty of said officers to apprehend them, and as soon thereafter as may be to deliver them to the owners, or their representatives, to whom such payment may have been made; and upon such delivery it shall be the duty of the said officers to notify the district attorney for the time being of the district in which the owner may reside, of such delivery, whereupon the master shall become liable to the United States for the value of such fugitive at the time of such delivery, to be recovered by the said district attorney of the master by suit in said circuit court.

Mr. Pratt. I suppose that the amendment which I have had the honor to offer for the consideration of the Senate, has been read by almost every Senator present. The Senate will perceive that it proceeds upon the hypothesis, that the Constitution of the United States imposes upon the Federal Government the obligation to deliver to the master his fugitive slave, when the slave shall have escaped from the State within which the master resides to any other State of this Union. The clause of the Constitution is in these words:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therin, be discharged from such service or labor, *but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.*"

Here is an express constitutional direction that fugitive slaves, who shall thus escape, shall be delivered up on *claim* of the party to whom the service or labor is due. Now, sir, if there had been no decision of the Supreme Court giving a construction to this article of the Constitution, and if there had been no legislation in conformity with it, or to carry it out, there might be some doubt as to the party upon whom this obligation is imposed. But Congress in 1793 passed a law, to which reference was made on yesterday, by which Congress declares that the master shall be entitled to seize or arrest his fugitive slave whenever he shall escape from him into another State of the Union. It then makes it the duty of the master to take the fugitive that he has so seized before a judge or committing magistrate. It makes it the duty of the magistrate, not as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Dayton] and others seem to suppose, to summon a jury to determine the rights of the master, but it makes it the duty of the judge or magistrate before whom the servant is taken by the master, to determine as to the right of the master, and then the obligation is imposed on the judge or magistrate to issue his certificate to the master, who is entitled by virtue of that certificate to carry the slave from the State into which he had escaped, back to the State whence he fled. Now, in connection with this constitutional provision and the act of 1793, the consideration of the Senate has already been directed, upon more than one occasion, to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania *vs.* Prigg, and the Supreme Court, in that case, decided that the constitutional provision and the act of 1793 impose obligations upon the Federal Government to discharge toward the master the duty of delivering to the owner, upon his claim, his fugitive from labor or service; and the Supreme Court further decided that all State laws passed in reference to this provision are unconstitutional; that they could not appoint any State officer for the purpose of executing this provision; and that it is exclusively the duty of the Federal Government to execute the obligation to which I have referred. Now, sir, the amendment which I have had the honor to propose, is predicated upon this proposition, that, where, as here, there is a clear, distinct, manifest obligation imposed by the Constitution in reference to property therein recognized as such, to deliver up that property to the owner, when claimed by him, there follows, as a consequence of a neglect to perform that duty, an obligation on the parties upon whom it is imposed to pay for the property. I apprehend that no proposition can be clearer than this, that where any competent authority imposes on an individual a binding, legal, constitutional obligation to do a particular thing, to deliver up to an individual property which belongs to him, that, from the non-discharge upon the part of the individual of the obligation so imposed, there would necessarily result a liability on the part of the individual to pay the damage or loss consequent to the owner. I think that there is no legal mind in the Senate, no member of the Senate who will deny this proposition. I apprehend, also, that the further proposition cannot be denied, that where an obligation imposed on an individual is binding, the same obligation would be binding if imposed in the same language upon the Federal Government. Here, then, I have made out, I think, that under the Constitution, and the construction of that Constitution by the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government of the United States had assumed the obligation to deliver to the owners of fugitive slaves those slaves, whenever claimed by the owners. Now, I say that no mind, as it appears to me, can dissent from the conclusion that the non-compliance by the Federal Government with the obligation so imposed, would necessarily devolve upon the Government the obligation to pay the master for the loss which he may have sustained by reason of this dereliction of duty on the part of that Government. The principle of the amendment is based upon this theory.

If I might claim the indulgence of the Senate, I would be glad, for a very few moments, to call their attention to the subject—or one of the subjects—which has been under discussion for the last six months, for the purpose of showing that the amendment which I have proposed is one that would tend more effectually to establish peace and harmony between the two sections of the country than any of those hitherto acted on by this body. It was well said by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Winthrop] yesterday, that there are people, both North and South, who desire the separation of this Union, and the destruction of the Federal Government. Those at the North have been actuated by a wish to abolish Slavery, and their desire to destroy the Government proceeds from the proclaimed fact, on their part, that the Constitution of the United States protects the master in his right to his slave as property, and the consequent inability, on their part, to abolish Slavery. This, then, is the fanatic notion of those persons at the North, who desire to destroy the Government of the country. Now, there is a class of persons at the South, who, for reasons the exact opposite of those which have induced Northern men to entertain these opinions, look to the Government of the country with like aversion, and think that a dissolution of this Union would be of advantage to the South, because this description of property would be better protected under a separate Southern government, than it is protected now under the Federal Government. And why, sir? Mr. President, these dangers to the institutions of our country have grown out of the daily excitement which is attempted to be produced, here and elsewhere, upon this subject. We find petitions flowing in here daily from the Northern section of our Union, asking that this property belonging to the South be rendered useless to them. It must be recollected by Senators, that the value of this property at the South is estimated at $1,600,000,000. Now, when that is brought to the consideration of the Senate—when members reflect that there is a portion of this country owning a description of property valued at $1,600,000 000, and that daily efforts are made here to induce a state of public opinion by which that large amount of property is to be rendered valueless, they cannot help seeing that there is just cause for excitement on the part of the South. Every one knows that the constitutional provision, and the act of 1793, which I have called to the notice of the Senate, have not afforded an adequate remedy to the South, in reference to their slaves who have escaped from them. Now, the questions submitted to the Senate by the amendment I have proposed, is, whether they are willing to protect the South in this admitted constitutional right; and if they do not pass a law sufficiently efficient to carry out the obligation on the part of the Federal Government to deliver to the owner his slaves, when they escape, whether they will not pay the owner out of the coffers of the National Treasury for the non-compliance with that obligation.

Some years ago, when I was Governor of the State of Maryland—a State more interested in the subject of the present bill than any other State in the Union, and with Virginia and Kentucky, and perhaps Tennessee and Missouri, the only States which are interested practically in the bill—various attempts were made by me in my executive capacity to enforce the rights of the citizens of my State under the act of 1783, and under the constitutional provision. The Legislature of Maryland had passed a law making it a felony for a slave to escape from his master. The law is certainly not unconstitutional, unless it shall be contended that the separate States of this Union have not a right to declare in reference to their own people what shall be felony within their own limits. Several negroes then who had escaped were indicted for this offence, and upon the indictments I issued requisitions to the Governor of Pennsylvania for the delivery of the servants who had escaped, and had thereby committed the felony created by this statute. The Governor of Pennsylvania refused to deliver them up. After that refusal was made known to me, other cases occurred, and I advised the owners to proceed under the act of 1793. They did go to Pennsylvania. They apprehended and seized their servants, as expressly authorized by the act of 1793. They took their servants before a magistrate, as required by that act. The magistrates heard the claims of the masters, and decided in their favor, and after that decision, and after the magistrates had given their certificates, the servants were taken by a mob from the custody of their masters, and the master in one instance was murdered in the streets of one of the cities of Pennsylvania! And although the good people of that Commonwealth looked with as much horror on the act as the people of any other community in this Union, yet, because of public opinion there, they were unable to punish the men who had perpetrated this foul murder. Whilst I was Governor of Maryland a servant deliberately attempted the life of his master, by shooting at him through the window of his house at night. That servant was indicted for an attempt to murder. The negro escaped from jail and took refuge in the city of Philadelphia. On the indictment I issued a requisition on the Governor of Pennsylvania to deliver up the servant as a fugitive from justice. The Governor of Pennsylvania issued his requisition and the servant was arrested. A long trial was then had whether the Governor's warrant was sufficient. The presiding judge, however, determined that the servant ought to be surrendered to his master, and directed him to be. After his delivery, in consequence of the violence of a mob, the negro was placed in charge of the sheriff of the county of Philadelphia, to be detained until the agent of the owner in Maryland could safely carry him beyond the limits of Pennsylvania. Whilst he was in jail a writ of habeas corpus was issued by another judge: the fellow indicted for murder was taken out of prison, and by some agency placed beyond the control of justice, and we have never heard of him from that day to this. Now some twenty cases of a like kind to those which I have recited occurred during the three years that I was Governor of Maryland. Senators, therefore, cannot be surprised that the people of any section of this country would be excited when such scenes occurred before them as this; when their property is seduced from them, and when, after reclaiming it under the constitutional provision and the act of 1793, a lawless mob can interfere, rescue it, and murder the master, and remain unpunished; and when one State has declared a particular act to be felony, that the Governor of the other State shall decide that that act is unconstitutional, and refuse to deliver up a party indicted for felony, because he chooses to think that the law creating the offence a felony is unconstitutional. Why is all this? It is because of the sympathy upon the part of those persons for the slaves. It illustrates the remark which I must say I was very sorry to hear from the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday, that no law in this country could be executed unless the people of the place where it was to be executed were in favor of it. So it is with reference to this large amount of property, estimated at $1,600,000,000. No matter what law you may place on the statute book—and you can place no law more distinct than this clause of the Constitution; you can frame no law which imposes with more obligatory force the duty to deliver up than the act of 1793—place any law you please on the statute book, the people of the free States, having their sympathies excited in favor of the slave, refuse to execute the law. The law is a nullity because the will of the people is against it, to use the language of the Senator from Massachusetts. What protection then, have we for this $1,600,000,000 worth of property? Can we pass any efficient law unless such a one as I have had the honor to propose? The bill which you have under consideration provides that officers appointed by law shall take affidavits and deliver up these persons. You have already the act of 1793. The act of 1793 has not been executed, not because its provisions were not adequate, but because its execution was against the will of the people where the law was to be enforced. The facts which I have detailed as having occurred in my own State (and hundreds of similar cases will be within recollection of all who hear me) clearly demonstrate the utter inefficiency of the existing laws, and I ask Senators to point out the feature in the bill now under consideration which would be more effectual when similar cases shall hereafter occur. I ask, then, whether the most just as well as the most efficient remedy would not be to impose upon the Federal Government (which, under the decision of the Supreme Court, is alone authorized to discharge that duty) the obligation to pay the damage, if they fail to discharge the duty?

The American people are essentially a practical people. I never shall believe that they are willing to risk the destruction of this Government upon a mere abstraction. Now, permit me to ask my friends on the other side of the Chamber, what do they propose for themselves? Let me ask the Senators from Massachusetts, or any other gentleman whose States entertain (not that they do) different opinions from those entertained by you and I, what it is their people desire, unless it is the abolition of Slavery? There is nothing practical other than this which can grow out of all this agitation upon their part. Now let me put a further question to them. Conceding, for the purpose of the argument, the right of the General Government to abolish Slavery within the States, would their people consent to the exercise of such power, in view of its necessary consequences? It is admitted by all the Senators upon this floor—even by the Senator from New York. [Mr. Seward]—that if the Government should abolish Slavery anywhere, an obligation is imposed upon it to pay for the slaves. Here, then, is $1,600,000,000 worth of slaves. I ask my friend from Massachusetts, would his State, would any respectable portion of the people of his State, consent to abolish Slavery to-day, if every southern State in the Union should say that he, as the representative of Massachusetts, shall be empowered to abolish it? What would it impose upon the Federal Government? It would oblige the Federal Government to pay $1,600,000,000, the interest on which would be $96,000,000 annually—more than double the entire income of the country. Will any portion of the people of this country, North or South, consent that the Federal Government shall assume these $1,600,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out this mere miserable abstraction? If it was to be paid by the States, it would impose upon the State of New York liability to pay $192,000,000, on my own State $32,000,000, and on Massachusetts $64,000,000. Let me ask Senators, is there a State in this Union which would either agree that the Federal Government would assume this debt of $1,600,000,000, the annual payment of interest on which would be $96,000,000, or that their individual States should assume a separate obligation to pay their quota of that amount? If the South would consent that you would abolish Slavery, can you abolish it? Has the General Government the capacity to pay this amount? Have the individual States, if it is to be assumed by them, the ability to pay their share of the debt which would thus be imposed upon them? Is there a Senator here representing any State who will say that his people will consent, on a mere abstraction, to risk the mighty destinies of this great country upon a question which gives them a power they would not exercise if they could, and which they could not exercise if they had the will, because of their inability to pay this enormous amount?

But, independent of this $1,600,000,000 which would be imposed on the Federal Government by the abolition of Slavery, as a consequence of it would be the necessary obligation to remove the slaves beyond the limits of the country; for no philanthropic mind can for a moment believe that there could exist in the southern States a preponderance of that description of population without their being slaves. Those philanthropists who would agree to such a thing, would agree to an evil preferable to which would be the entire destruction of the whole of the black race at one single moment. It would be better for them that you should pass a law by which they should be brought up and at once destroyed, than that they should undergo accumulated miseries year after year. The ultimate result would be the same.

I have given the subject every consideration, and I am sure there cannot be any well-founded constitutional objection to the proposition which I have submitted. I read this morning in the *Union* the abstract of a speech delivered by a member of this body [Mr. Seward] before the people of a non-slaveholding State of this Union, which shows the character of the aggressions which have excited the feelings of the South upon this subject. Permit me to read two extracts from that speech.

I ask the attention of those Senators, who, at one time, were disposed to protect the individual referred to from the just censure which his remarks, made in this body, ought to have imposed upon him, to the sentiments expressed by him on this occasion:

"It is written [says he] in the Constitution of the United States that five slaves shall count as equal to three freemen, as a basis of representation; and it is written, also, *in violation of the Divine law*, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave who takes a refuge at our firesides from his relentless pursuer."

Then his advice is "reform your own code." This is the advice given to the people of Ohio, a non-slaveholding State, at a mass meeting, and given to a people who have produced as much of this excitement on the subject of fugitive slaves as those of any other State. This is the advice given to that people by one standing high in the estimation of his own State:

"Reform your own code; extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and *defend him as you would your household gods.*"

Yes, sir, "defend him as you would your household gods."

Mr. Foote. What Senator do you allude to?

Mr. Cass. The "higher law."

Mr. Pratt. That is it. Now, I ask those Senators who represent the non-slaveholding States of this Union, can you expect that the great object which the Senate has had in view for the last six months—that of producing peace and harmony between the people of the two sections of this Union—can be attained, when you have language such as this used at mass meetings of the people, by persons standing before them in the position which the speaker on this occasion occupied? Can you believe, sir, that this harmony can be produced by any action here, any law which you may pass here, merely having for its object the delivering up of the fugitive slave? Here these people are advised not to deliver them up, but to protect them, and defend them, as they would their household gods. The people, sir, not seeing the constitutional obligations resting upon them as fully as we see them, will obey these instructions; and if, as the Senator from Massachusetts said, this law cannot be executed unless the community favor the law, I ask what will be the use of it? Can you expect the persons holding this vast amount of property, this $1,600,000,000 of property, to be content with it? And can you thus leave the subject, and say that you have discharged all your obligations in regard to it, by passing a law, which at the very time of its passage, you say cannot be executed, because the people upon whom it is to operate will resist it? Sir, is this a Government, or is it not? Is it a government which we ought to [illegible], and which we ought to be proud of? is it worth fighting for?—more, is it worth living for? Here is a constitutional obligation imposed, a constitutional right conferred, the right of property admitted, the direction to the Government implicit to protect that property; and yet, when it is not protected, the Government is not to be answerable for it? The Government can pass no law which shall be effectual, because the people will not execute that law; and yet the Government is not to pay for the loss thereby sustained? Are gentlemen prepared to assume that position? Sir, I am prepared, in reference to the amendment which I have offered, to defend its provisions, I think, against any attack which may be made upon them based upon constitutional or other grounds. I believe it to be the only remedy in the power of Congress to offer, which will settle now and forever the agitation upon the subject of fugitive slaves. The North cannot say it is unjust to them, because the South will pay at least one half of the value of those fugitives, which, by reason of a "higher law," or some other, they are unable to reclaim. The South, I hope, in that spirit of harmony which has heretofore governed their counsels, and which, I hope, will continue to govern them, will agree to accept this as the only means in the power of the Government by which the constitutional provision in reference to their rights, can be executed. If we pass this law, there will cease to be this excitement in regard to fugitive slaves, either in Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, or any of the States who are subjected to their loss; because then the masters can go to the State into which their slaves have escaped, and by pursuing the course indicated in this amendment, if the officer of the Government does not discharge his duty, if the Government of the United States will not do what it is pledged by the Constitution to do, then the right is given them to come back on the Government and say, "You refuse or neglect to comply with this constitutional obligation; now pay us for the loss we have sustained."

I have heard it intimated that it may be objected that, under such a provision, persons in the Southern States might voluntarily suffer their negroes to escape. This cannot be a sound objection, because the owner is to make an affidavit of the involuntary escape of the slave. He is not only to do that, but he is to institute a suit for his recovery after his non-delivery by the officer of the United States Government, and is, by legal and competent proof, (other proof, therefore, than his own testimony,) in the circuit court, before a jury summoned by that tribunal, to show that he made the demand for his servant whilst he was in the bailiwick of the officer on whom he made the [illegible] to prove that he is his slave by testimony which shall be admitted by the judges of the court to be competent as such proof. But, sir, no candid man, who will look at this subject, can say that there is any danger of abuse to be apprehended from this source, because to say that there is, is to say that, notwithstanding the violation of his oath involved—for that is the supposition—he is willing to incur its responsibilities for the purpose of manumitting his own servant, and getting pay for him. The master who could be so kind as to entertain so strong a desire for the manumission of his servant would be too good to take a false oath; and no man who desired to obtain money for a servant which he had in his possession, and could sell at any moment, would resort to this means to obtain his value, when it could only be done after a tedious litigation, and the requirement of proof which he might be unable to furnish. No man would suffer his slave voluntarily to escape for the purpose of obtaining, through the medium of this amendment, only that which he could obtain by selling his servant at once.

I repeat, without going further at this time into the consideration of this subject, I shall hope, with the assistance of the other friends of the bill, to be able to answer successfully any objection which can be urged to its passage. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

After some remarks from Messrs. Winthrop, Dayton, Badger, and Butler, the Senate adjourned.

Wednesday, *August* 21, 1850.

The bill and the amendments being again under consideration—

Mr. Pratt said: I desire to occupy the attention of the Senate but for a very short time, to answer the argument made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Dayton] to day, which seems to be a mere repetition of the argument which he made before, and what I am about to say may be properly considered as a continuation of the remarks with which I troubled the Senate yesterday. I had not the pleasure of hearing the first objection which he urged to the amendment, but which, I understand, related to some of its details. I cannot, consequently, reply to it. But the first objection which I did hear was, that, under the amendment which I have proposed, the trial which is to be had is to be transferred from the State where the slave is arrested to the State from which he fled, and in which the master resides. Now, this is an objection to the details of this bill, and if the Senator's objection rests merely upon matters of detail, I think it was his duty, this being a measure of so much consequence, and so well calculated to restore peace and harmony to the two sections of the country, to have offered some amendment by which his objection would be obviated, so that he might carry out the principle of the bill in accordance with his own views. The argument of the Senator upon this objection is, that the trial is to be held in the State from which the slave fled, without any provision for notice to the marshal or officer of the United States Government whose duty it had been to deliver the slave in the State to which he had escaped; and that, consequently, the master might obtain a verdict without a fair trial, so far as the United States are concerned.

Surely, Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey could not have examined with his usual care the amendment to which he has urged that objection; because it is expressly made the duty of the district attorney of the United States, who is made the defendant in the suit, to protect the interest of the United States. What, then, is he obliged to do in order to conform to the duty so imposed upon him? He knows by the declaration required to be filed at the commencement of the suit, upon which the verdict is to be rendered, that one of the issues is, whether the master made application to the proper officer for the delivery of his servant in the State into which that servant had escaped, and whether the servant was within the bailiwick of the officer at the time he made the demand. This, then, is one of the issues to be tried by the jury—a jury summoned in a court of the United States, the defendant being an officer of the United States. Why, sir, I cannot but think the Senator will see that this objection is certainly taken from under him. Because, where an officer of the United States is made the defendant, whose duty it is to defend the rights of the United States, and when one of the issues to be tried is, whether the master made application to the officer of the United States for the delivery of the servant, and whether the servant was within the bailiwick of that officer at the time the demand was made, it cannot be believed that this officer, who is to act on the part of the United States, would not have all the witnesses there necessary for the defence.

But, sir, turning from this objection in reference to the details of the bill, I come to the objection which the Senator has urged to the principle, as he terms it, of the amendment; and in regard to this he has reiterated the assertion that the principle of my amendment is to make the United States the endorser upon this subject for all the defaulting States. Now, if the Senator will give me his attention, and I do not convince his mind that he is wrong in this, I would consent almost to vote against the amendment which I have offered. Unlike the Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. Butler,] who addressed the Senate upon this point yesterday, the Senator from New Jersey, I take it for granted, believes that he is governed and ought to be governed by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in reference to all constitutional questions. I suppose that is the doctrine of the Senator from New Jersey. Now, what is the meaning of being "the endorser?" What is the idea he designed to convey? Not, of course, an endorsement, as we understand it, commercially speaking; but he means that the United States assume a liability which properly belongs to the States.

Mr. Butler. It is perhaps right that I should state here, (with the permission of my friend from Maryland,) as the proposition I stated yesterday has been referred to, that I said that I was willing to be governed by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania *vs.* Prigg, so far as regards the only question adjudicated but not beyond that; and I then said, that in my opinion, the only question adjudicated was the one decided by Chief Justice Taney.

Mr. Pratt. I understood the Senator from South Carolina yesterday to say, in reference to that decision, that he would be governed by it only so far as he considered it right, and good law. That, however, is not the doctrine of the Senator from New Jersey. He believes that the Supreme Court is a tribunal appointed by the Constitution for the purpose of deciding constitutional questions, and that its decision in regard to constitutional questions is final and conclusive.

Now, the proposition of the Senator from New Jersey is, that the United States are the endorsers for the defaulting States; that is, that they are assuming a liability only belonging secondarily to the United States, and primarily to the States themselves. The Senator cannot read the case of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania *vs.* Prigg without admitting that the Supreme Court have there decided that this constitutional obligation to deliver up the fugitive slave to his master is an obligation imposed on the United States Government *alone;* and that not only have the State governments no such obligation imposed on them, but that it is unconstitutional for the State governments to exercise any jurisdiction in the matter. I defy the Senator from New Jersey, if he has read that decision, to deny that it is as I have stated it to be. Therefore I have these propositions, which are conclusive upon the argument made by that Senator: first, that the Supreme Court has decided that there is *no liability,* primary or secondary, on the part of the State governments and consequently that the United States cannot be assumed to hold the attitude of an endorser for the States, because not only were the States never bound to discharge the duty from which the liability arises, but, according to the Supreme Court, they have no constitutional power to discharge it. The Supreme Court have decided that any law passed by a State in reference to the discharge of this supposed liability [illegible] by the gentleman is predicated, would be an unconstitutional law, and therefore void. Here, then, instead of the Federal Government being the endorser for the defaulting States, the Federal Government, under the Constitution and under the decision of the Supreme Court, are the original defaulters; themselves, and the only defaulters; they are not to be placed as a substitute for the States, for they are the only party who were primarily or secondarily liable. But the Senator says that no law involving the principle of this amendment has ever passed. And it was said to me this morning by a friend, very politely, that he could not support my amendment because it was a foolish amendment, and he could not think of voting for a foolish amendment.

Mr. Dayton. The Senator did not hear me say so.

Mr. Pratt. I did not impute it to you.

Mr. Dayton. You were speaking in connection with my argument, and it might be so understood.

Mr. Pratt. I was about to remark that the proposition involved in the amendment may be new to the minds of some Senators, but to me it is not a new one. Some years ago, a lawless mob in the city of Baltimore, uncontrolled by the city authorities, destroyed the property of some of her citizens. In England, whence of our principles of law are derived, the city would have been liable for the damage thus occasioned, but there being no such law in our State, the injured parties applied to the Legislature of Maryland, and they at once assumed that, as Maryland was bound to protect the lives and property of her citizens, she was also liable for damages arising from the non-compliance by her with that obligation, when she did not employ sufficient force to insure that end. That is the principle she adopted as a sovereign State, and it is a principle which should be ingrafted on every republican government. Every citizen of a republic *should feel that his life and property are fully protected by the government under which he lives.* Nothing short of this will insure the allegiance of the citizen and the consequent perpetuity of the Government. Now, is not this an occasion for the application of that principle? The Senator from New Jersey says that such a case has never occurred before. I know of hundreds of them. Let me suggest one: Under the late treaty between the United States and Mexico, the United States have pledged themselves to protect, for a certain period, the people of Mexico from the depredations of the Indians. I believe that is substantially the compact in the treaty. Now, suppose the United States did not afford this protection, and that the Indians were to go there, and by depredations on the Mexicans destroy a hundred thousand or a million dollars worth of property—would the Senator contend that the United States would not at once pay them?

Mr. Dayton. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. Pratt yielded the floor.

Mr. Dayton. But suppose that the Government were to carry out the obligations of the treaty, and were to put a sufficient number of troops there for the defence of it, yet by some kind of accident a Mexican house was to be burnt, or some Mexican property lost, does the Senator mean to say that the Mexican could call upon this government to be responsible for the damage for not supplying the proper defences?

Mr. Pratt. That is the very case I was about to put. Suppose that the United States send what they deem a sufficient number of troops for the purpose of carrying out this treaty obligation on their part; but suppose these troops, before they reach the frontier, are seized by an American mob, and shut up in prison, so as to be unable to reach their destination, would the United States then not be bound to pay to the Mexicans for any losses they might sustain in consequence of the absence of those troops? Again: suppose that the soldiers reach their destination; but, instead of protecting the Mexicans, run away; or suppose that the force is utterly inadequate for the purpose; or suppose, in a word—for it comes to that at last—they fail to fulfil this treaty obligation; would they not be bound to pay for any loss which might occur in consequence? The treaty guaranties to the Mexicans the protection of their property. That is precisely what the Constitution guaranties to the slaveholder. And I say, for one, that if the United States do not discharge that obligation, and if the Mexicans are not protected, that I should hold that we are bound to indemnify them; and so are we also bound to indemnify citizens of the United States for losses occasioned to them by reason of the non-compliance of the Government with a well-recognized constitutional obligation.

But the Senator says that if you admit the principle involved in this amendment, there are hundreds and thousands of cases daily occurring which would entail upon the Government a like obligation to pay money out of the Treasury, to gratify the same principle. I ask the Senator to read to the Senate, or suggest to me, a single clause of the Constitution which enforces the same obligation on this Government, in reference to property? I assert, and I do it with diffidence, but to the best of my recollection, that this is the only clause in the Constitution which, in direct terms, admitted by all, obliges the General Government to perform a specific obligation in reference to property. But, to carry out the idea which I was about to extend when the Senator from New Jersey asked my indulgence to suffer him to propound a question, what was the relative positions of the slave States and the Federal Government at the time of the formation of this Constitution? Why, sir, Maryland was a sovereign State then, as much as Mexico is a sovereign Government now. So were all these States. Well, the Constitution is a simple treaty, or agreement on the part of those States to give up a part of their respective sovereign rights for the purpose of forming a General Government. That was the compact between those sovereign States forming the Government of the United States; thereby making a compact between that Government and each of the States separately, in reference to all the obligations which were imposed upon them by the Constitution or treaty. You can therefore, make no distinction between an obligation assumed at the formation of the Constitution of the United States, towards the State of Maryland, and the obligation assumed by the United States in the treaty with Mexico. Maryland was then as sovereign as Mexico is now. She would not have entered into this treaty with the General Government, it is possible, but for this obligation assumed by the Government. My honorable friend from Mississippi, [Mr. Davis,] the other day, and my honorable friend from South Carolina, [Mr. Butler,] yesterday expressed but little interest in the fate of this bill, introduced by the Senator from Virginia, because they believed that if adopted it would be ineffectual. The Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. Winthrop,] and indeed all who have spoken on that side, admit that they believe that the bill will be ineffectual. Here, then, is the case presented to the Senate and the country. Now, I would say to my worthy friends that they have no right to speak for Maryland, and Kentucky, and Virginia, on this subject, because they are not interested in this matter. In all matters in which their people are particularly interested in reference to the Slavery question, I should feel it my duty to stand by them.

This is the first time a question in which the people of Maryland are peculiarly interested has been presented to the Senate; and I now claim that they who are less interested in this matter shall stand by us. The constituents of the Senators from South Carolina, Mississippi, and Georgia can seldom loose their servants, and are not consequently interested in the amendment. Now, I ask the Senator from New Jersey to suppose for a moment that his State stood in the attitude in which my State does, or in which Kentucky does. Not less than $80,000 worth of this description of property is annually lost by the citizens of my State, in consequence of the non-compliance by the Government of the United States with this solemn obligation, entered into by them at the time we became a party to this Government. Now, suppose New Jersey stood in that position; suppose that they had property which their citizens were daily losing, and that when they went to a sister State for the purpose of recovering it, under laws established by the General Government, whose exclusive duty the Supreme Court had decided it was to deliver up this property, their citizens were murdered, and their property carried off. I ask the Senator from New Jersey, would not his citizens be just as excited as mine are? I do believe that at the period at which I occupied the executive chair of Maryland, if a prudent course of conciliation had not been advised, and an opposite course had been pursued, a collision between the people of Maryland and the people of the sister State of Pennsylvania could not have been avoided. Here was one of our most respectable citizens, a man who stood as high as any on this floor, numerously connected both in Virginia and Maryland, who went to a sister State and, under the laws of the United States, arrested and took possession of his servant; a mob collected, wrested the servant from him, and took the life of that estimable and respected individual. And this, independent of all the other cases which I enumerated yesterday, will show the Senator the difficulty which we have to induce our citizens to forego the vengeance which such wrongs would naturally excite. Now I say that the people of New Jersey would be less apt than the people of Maryland to respect a Government whose laws did not afford them protection which the Constitution of that Government, expressly entitled themto. In arguing this same proposition yesterday, my friend from South Carolina, [Mr. Butler,] having a mind which is incapable of conceiving or doing injustice, expressed the impossibility of his voting for this amendment; yet I apprehend that he himself did state a principle which will compel him to vote for it. What is his proposition, and why cannot he vote for this amendment? It is because he does not recognize the principle decided in the case of Pennsylvania *vs.* Prigg. It is because he is not willing to assent here to the doctrine that the States are not bound to conform to this requisition of the Constitution by delivering the fugitives. That is his proposition; and what is its reverse? Of course if the Supreme Court is right—if there is no obligation imposed on the States—if it is imposed, as we contend, expressly and solely upon the General Government, the Senator would come to an opposite conclusion to that to which, because of the fact that he does not concur in this opinion in reference to the exclusion of this obligation on the part of the separate States, he now comes. The Senator has no constitutional objection to the amendment, but his ground, is that he does not concede that the States are not obliged to discharge that duty, and therefore he thinks that it is the States, and not the Federal Government, which should be made to pay these damages. But I ask my friend for one moment to see in what a position he leaves us. Here the Supreme Court says that the States are not bound to discharge this duty—not that they are prevented from aiding in its discharge; that is not the question, for the privilege of aiding in the discharge of a duty does not impose any obligation—but they decide that the States are not *actually bound* to discharge the obligation for the non-performance of which the payment of damages is proposed to be required. Now, this is the decision of the Supreme Court; and although my friend may not concur in that opinion, except as expressed in the opinion of Justice Taney and others, in which he does concur, and although he may say that the citizens of the States, as good citizens, are bound to do so and so in aid of the law of the United States, yet that imposes no obligations on the States *as States*, or upon the citizens as citizens, other than the general obligation to perform all duties as good citizens. What position are we in then? His position is, that the States are liable, and that he cannot impose on the General Government obligations under which he believes (though the Supreme Court have decided to the contrary) the States are liable. Now I have shown you that we cannot make the States liable, and that the only hope we can have of our property being protected is by making liable the General Government, the party who originally undertook the obligation, and the party who agreed at the time these States entered into the Union to do this particular thing.

Let me ask my southern friends—those whose constituents are not subjected to the losses which mine are, those who have heretofore argued this question, and who admit that no unconstitutional act is involved in the passage of this amendment—what objection they can have to its passage? They admit that the residue of the law without this

amendment would be ineffectual. Senators on the other side of the Chamber say it would be ineffectual; and the experience of Maryland and Virginia shows that it would be ineffectual. Any law you can pass cannot impose more stringently than the act of 1793 the obligation upon the free States to deliver up the fugitive. Indeed, previous to the abolition agitation hundreds of cases have occurred where the owners of slaves escaping from Virginia and Maryland have had them delivered to them: but since abolition has become an active element in the political contests of the day, I do not know a single case in which the fugitive has been surrendered to his master. Now, I ask my friends from the other section of the Union, what objection can you have to the adoption of this amendment? You say that you want an effectual law: I know you do for I am sure that every Senator here desires this constitutional provision to be carried out You admit that any law which has for its object simply the delivery up of the fugitive will be ineffectual, and still refuse your support to this amendment, which will be efficient. I ask my northern friends to reconcile this inconsistency, and to say whether they are willing to put their votes on record here against a proposition by which these slaveowners, who, from the organization of our Government down to the present time or at any rate since the period that abolition has entered as a political element into the agitation of the country, have been unprotected by any law of the United States, shall receive this small chance of idemnity? Ask if they are willing to do this, they themselves admitting that the law proposed to us without that amendment would be utterly ineffectual? It was said yesterday by a Senator here that the free States were willing to give, and indeed that we have already our remedy by bringing actions for, damages against the parties who may resist us in the attempt to recapture our slaves, and two cases were read to us where such damages were recovered.

Now, I appeal to the fair and candid judgment of the Senator who read those cases, and I ask him to say, on his honor as a Senator, does he not know that such a remedy is utterly unavailable? What does it amount to? It depends upon the fact whether the rioter is a man of property or not. You may bring your action for damages and recover judgment, but can you collect money from these rioters, who of course are worth nothing? Therefore, in the cases referred to, where damages were awarded of five or twenty thousand dollars, what were such verdicts worth? We all know that in the nature of things, rioters, those persons who disregard the law, have no property to be affected by the judgement incurred for its violation. To set this forth as a remedy, then—unintentional though it be on the part of the Senators doing it—is wounding the feelings of the South and insulting their judgement. What else can it be styled, to tell them that the Constitution obliges the States to deliver the fugitive negroes up, and if these people refuse to do it, your remedy is by bringing a suit against the mob?

Mr. President, there is much in relation to the subject which is entirely misunderstood One argument that I have heard, as an objection in relation to this subject—not particularly connected with this provision of this bill, it is true—is, that the North have some reason of complaint, upon the ground that the South are represented in Congress, in the other branch, on the basis of their slave population. Why sir, when the present census shall have been concluded, and we shall be obliged, as we will be shortly, to re-arrange the representation in the other branch in consequence of that census, you will find that Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania, will each of them have at least one Representative predicted upon their free negro population—a population just as far from being politically free as are the servants of Maryland, not being permitted to vote, and having no political privileges. Yes, sir, the political freemen of Pennsylvania will be represented in Congress, and the seat of one of their Representatives will be based upon this free negro population.

When I offered this amendment I had at least the hope that all the Senators representing the southern States would, upon this question, (although they have upon no other) been found to stand shoulder to shoulder in this endeavor to procure protection to a portion of their fellow-citizens holding the same description of property as themselves. I was in hopes, also, that fair-minded men, representing northern constituencies here, would have been willing to give us this amendment; which will be effectual to the protection of the South in this particular, and which would have in the slave States of this Union more influence in producing harmony and peace, and a restoration of fraternal relations between themselves and their sister States, than all other action which could be had by this Government in reference to the South. There may be no immediate danger of a dissolution of the Union, but if this course of agitation is persisted in, what will it be worth? It is now, minutes from year to year, until your constituents and mine, instead of feeling as brothers and fellow-citizens towards each other, shall become, after crimination and recrimination on either side, as personal enemies, having the feelings of personal enmity towards each other, what then will this Union be worth? When that day shall arrive, and it seems to be fast approaching, then all our efforts here or elswhere will not prevent a dissolution of the Union, because to continue together would be worse than dissolution. Adopt this amendment and I fervently believe that you take away from this strife one of the chief elements of discord. By its passage by the votes of the northern section of the Union, you give to the South a substantial evidence, which they can understand, of your desire to do them justice. I do hope that the Senate will reflect upon this amendment. I have not offered it without due and proper reflection, and without being convinced on my part that a measure of this kind is the only remedy by which this agitation can be arrested and justice done to the slave-owners.

PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR TOWNS.

By Telegraph to the Southern Press.

MACON, Ga. Sep. 23—10 o'clock P. M.

To the Electors of the State of Georgia:

Below I forward the Proclamation of Governor Towns of Georgia:

GEORGE W. TOWNS, Governor of the said State, to the electors thereof, greeting: Having been officially informed that the Congress of the United States has admitted California into the Union of the Confederacy upon equal terms with the original States, a duty devolves upon me, in the performance of which I shall trespass upon the public but briefly. An unfeigned deference for public opinion, and the profound regard I entertain for the wisdom, firmness and patriotism of my fellow-citizens of Georgia, will not justify me, in a paper of this character, in repeating my known unchanged opinions as to the duty of the South in repelling Free Soil encroachment, and arresting by all proper means, usurpation by Congress. Whatever is compatible with the honor and obligations of the people of the State to the country, its laws and its institutions, I doubt not will receive their warm support, in an hour of danger, when your institutions are in jeopardy, your feelings wantonly outraged, your social organization derided, your honor deeply wounded and the Federal Constitution violated by a series of agressive measures, all tending to the consummation of one object—the abolition of Slavery. The common territory of all, which you have a right to occupy and enjoy, has been denied you in the solemn form of law, under pretences the most shallow—it well becomes you to assemble, to deliberate, and counsel together for your mutual preservation and safety, whatever it may cost. The extraordinary events by which we are encompassed, and the measures which it will demand or justify, must be left, as they should be, to the patriotism, firmness, and prudence of the people themselves. Upon them devolves the duty of redressing present wrongs, and providing other safeguards for future security—neither the one or the other of which however, will ever be effectually accomplished, until by patriotic efforts, perfect harmony and concord of feeling are restored, and concert of action produced among the people of the South.

In view, therefore, of the atrocious Free Soil sentiment and policy, not merely of the non-slave-holding States, but of the government—of the imminent peril to which the institution of Slavery is reduced by the act of Congress admitting the State of California into the Union with a constitution containing the principle of the Wilmot Proviso, and in defiance of our warning and earnest remonstrance—in view of the deplorable fact that some diversity of opinion exists in some of the Southern States, as to the proper mode of redressing the wrongs and avoiding the dangers which all must see and feel—let me, fellow citizens, earnestly entreat you to cultivate for each other a deep and abiding sentiment of fraternal regard and confidence, and approach the task, from which there is no escape, of deciding upon your duty to Georgia and the country, with a firm step but not without calm, deliberate, and patient investigation, consulting neither fears nor dangers on the one hand, nor permitting yourselves, from exasperated feelings of wrong on the other to be rashly urged to extreme measures, which have not received the full sanction of your judgement. Then I shall not despair of seeing the whole State, as one man, proposing nothing beyond what the emergency may demand, or failing to perform whatever patriotism, honor, and right may require at your hands.

The General Assembly of this State, by an act approved the 8th of Febuary, 1850, having required me upon the happening of certain events—one of which is the admission of California as a State into the Union—to issue a Proclamation ordering an election to be held in each and every County, for Delegates to a Convention of the people of this State, to take into consideration such measures as comport with the extraordinary posture of our relations to our co States, and to decide upon what measures are necessary and proper to be taken, compatible with our honor and Constitutional obligations, as well as more effectually to secure our right of property in slaves, and to arrest all aggressions by one section of the Union upon the free enjoyment of the Constitutional rights of the other; and, lastly, to preserve inviolate the equality of the States of the Union, as guaranteed under the Constitution; therefore, be it known, that I, George W. Towns, Governor of the State of Georgia, by the authority and mandate of the law, do issue this, my Proclamation, ordering and directing that the qualified voters of the most numerous branch of the General Assembly do meet at the several places in this State for holding elections, as fixed by law, in several Counties of this State, within the hour fixed for voting on Monday, the 25th day of November next, and then and there, by ballot, to elect two delegates in each of the Counties now entitled to one Representative in the General Assembly, and four delegates in such of the Counties as are now entitled to two Representatives The manager of said election are required to certify and forward to this Department the names of such elected in the manner prescribed by law for the election of Representatives in the General Assembly. And be it further ordered, that such delegates as may be elected by a majority of their Representative Counties be convened at the capital of said State on Tuesday, the 10th day of December next.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Executive Department at the capital in Milledgeville, this 23d day of September, in the year of our Lord, 1850.—GEORGE W. TOWNS, Governor.

J. W. PATTON, Secretary Executive Department.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment....Without Compromise.

NEW YORK: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1850.

THE FIRST BLOOD.

THE first case of capture under the infamous Fugitive Slave Law, which Northern Representatives and Senators passed, and the Northern President Fillmore signed, two or three weeks ago, occured in this city, on Saturday last. A statement of the facts will show that the story needs no embellishment, and that such an occurrence is a better commentary on the new law than any that could be made before the law was carried into execution.

James Hamlet, who, in his position as a porter in a store, has been known only as a sober, industrious, intelligent and trust-worthy man, has recently been employed by Mr. Silas Wood, Beaver street, and was at work there on Saturday, when two deputy U. S. Marshals called and required him to go with them as a witness in a certain case of larceny. He was taken to the U. S. Commissioners' office, Alexander Gardener presiding, and, on a charge of being a fugitive slave, after a brief examination of the person so claiming him, without any rebutting testimony being admitted, without the advice of counsel as to what plea he should make to establish his right to freedom, without time being allowed for the arrival of the counsel sent for, he was delivered over by the Commissioner, as a slave, to the claimant, who immediately demanded the protection and aid of the U. S. Marshal, to insure the safe return of the party to the residence of the said claimant, in Baltimore. Hereupon handcuffs were fastened upon the wrists of Hamlet; he was hurried into a carriage by the officers in whose custody he was placed, and in a few moments was on his way to Baltimore. He left behind him a wife and three young children, who were not even aware of his arrest till he was on his way to the South.

These are the bare facts in the case. A respectable man, upon a claim of two other men, who swore he was a slave, was hurried away without warning, without being permitted to see his friends, without any opportunity being granted him of showing his arrest to be illegal or unjustifiable—was torn from a young and dependant and attached family, and carried into interminable Slavery. Yet this act was perfectly legal, and every step was in accordance with the Fugitive Law recently passed. Let us look now at these steps.

Hamlet was arrested by authority of a warrant of which the following is a copy, though it is worthy to remark with what alacrity Marshal Talmadge's deputies sprung to the villainous work that was set them to do, entrapping the poor fellow, whom they were about to consign to a fate worse than death, by a lie:

To the Marshal of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and to his Deputies, or any or either of them—

Whereas complaint on oath, accompanied by proper proof, hath been made to me, charging that James Hamlet, a person held to service or labor in the State of Maryland, one of the United States of America, did, on or about the month of October, in the year 1848, escape into another State of the United States, and is now in the city and State of New York, in the Southern District of New York, a fugitive from such service or labor: Now, therefore, you are hereby commanded, in the name of the President of the United States of America, to apprehend the said James Hamlet, and bring his body forthwith before me, wherever he may be found; then and there to be dealt with, according to law, for the said offence. Given under my hand and seal, this 26th day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty, and of our Independence, the seventy-fifth.

ALEX. GARDINER,
United States Commissioner for the Southern District.

When the party arrived at the Commissioner's Office the following proceedings in the case were had, as reported in the Tribune:

THOMAS J. CLARE, (a man with dark eyes and hair) sworn—Is 30 years of age; clerk for Merchant's Shot Manufacturing Co. in Baltimore; knows James Hamlet; he is slave of Mary Brown, mother-in-law of mine, residing in Baltimore; have known Hamlet about 20 years; he left my mother-in-law about 2 years ago this season by absenting himself from the premises, the dwelling where he resided in Baltimore; she is entitled to his services; he is a slave for life; she never parted with him voluntarily; she came into possession of him by a will from John G. Brown, her deceased husband; the written paper shown is an exract from his will; she held him under that from the time she inherited him till he escaped, as I have testified; this is the man (pointing to H. a light mulatto man, about 24 or 25 years of age, looking exceedingly pensive.)

The witness then swore to the affidavit.

GUSTAVUS BROWN sworn—Am 25 years of age; reside in New York; clerk with A. M. Fenday, 25 Front st.; resided before coming here in Baltimore; I know James Hamlet; I have known him since a boy; he is a slave to my mother; he is a slave for life; my mother inherited him under the will of my father; he left her service by running away, I suppose, absenting himself from the house in the city of Baltimore, about two years since; I have seen him several times within the last six months, in the city; first time I saw him was in April last; my mother is still entitled to possession of him; she never has parted with him; the man sitting here (Hamlet) is the man.

Mr. Asa. Childs, Counsellor at Law, here came into the room, and took his seat; he said he had been sent to this morning, through another, by a gentleman with whom Hamlet had lived in this city, (Mr. S. N. Wood) but he has no directions in the matter; he merely came to see that the law is properly administered, and he supposed it would be without him.

Mr. C. was then shown the law, the power of attorney to Mr. Clare the affidavit of Mr. C. on which Hamlet was arrested—and the testimony thus far.

Mr. CLARE cross-examined by Mr. Child—I married Mrs. Brown's daughter about 17 years ago; Hamlet has always lived with us in the family; I am in her family now, and was at the time he went away; think he is about 28 years of age (he looks much younger than that—his features are very even, as those of a white person of the kind); he occasionally worked at the Shot Tower where I worked; he was hired there as a laborer, and Mrs. Brown got the benefit of him—that is when I had no other use for him; he had formerly been employed as a drayman; after I married into the family some year or two, we living together, I furnishing the house; such wages as I got for the man it was returned to Mrs. B. to be used as she saw fit; I was her agent to get employment for him as I could; I had him in various occupations; I have a power of attorney; I have no further interest in him than he is her property, and we wish to get him back to Maryland again where he left.

Mr. BROWN cross-examined—Left home 27th March last. Was home when Hamlet went away. At one time he was engaged at the Shot Tower business.

Mr. Child said he had no further questions to ask.—He supposed the rules of the law had been complied with.

Mr Gardiner, the Commissioner, then said, I will deliver the fugitive over to the Marshall, to be delivered over to the claimant.

Mr. Child suggested if that was the law. The Commissioner then said he would hand him, as the law said to the claimant, and if they should be any danger of rescue he would deliver him to the U. S. Marshall.

The United States Marshall said he had performed his duty in bringing him in.

Mr. Clare said he would demand such aid from the United States Marshall as would secure the delivery of the man to his owner in Baltimore.

Mr. Child suggested that it must be an affidavit that he apprehends a rescue. Mr. C. stated that he did so apprehend.

Mr. Talmadge, the Marshal, said he would have to perform his duty if called upon.

Mr. Child replied he supposed that he would, but there were doubts as to the form.

The necessary papers were made out by the Commissioner, Mr. Clare swearing he feared a rescue, and Hamlet was delivered to him, thence to the U. S. Marshall.

The Commissioner's order was as follows:

To whom these presents may come:

Whereas, complaint has been made before me, Alexander Gardiner, Commissioner duly appointed by the Circuit Court of the United States, for the Southern District of New York, in the Second Circuit, under and by virtue of the acts of Congress of February 20th, 1812, March 1st, 1817, and September 24th, 1789, on the oath of Thomas J. Clare, of the city of Baltimore, charging that James Hamlet, a person held to service or labor in the State of Maryland, did, on or about the month of October, 1848, escape into another State of the United States, from the State of Maryland, and from Mary Brown, a resident of the city of Balimore, in said State, to whom his service or labor is due. And whereas the said Thomas J. Clare did produce before me a certain power of attorney, in writing, acknowledged and certified under the seal of the Baltimore County Court, whereby he was duly authorized, by the said Mary Brown, the claimant of the said fugitive person, to take possession of and hold for her use and benefit the said James Hamlet; and whereas, upon such charge being made, as aforesaid, I, the said Commissioner, did issue my warrant in due form of law, for the arrest of the said James Hamlet; and whereas, the said James Hamlet has been brought before me, the said Commissioner, and the case heard in accordance with the provisions of the statute—Now I do certify that satisfactory proof has been produced before me, by the depositions of Thomas J. Clare, of the city of Baltimore, and Gustavus Brown, of the city of New York, and by an extract from the will of John G Brown, of the city of Baltimore, duly authenticated, that the services or labor of the said James Hamlet is due, for life, unto the said Mary Brown, of the city of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, that the said James Hamlet escaped from the State of Maryland in which such service or labor was due, to the state of New York, in which he has been arrested; and that the person in regard to whom such testimony has been produced is the said James Hamlet; and therefore, by virtue of the power in me vested by the act of Congress, in this behalf, I do authorize the said Mary Brown, or said Thomas J Clare, her attorney, to use such reasonable force and restraint as may be necessary, under the circumstances of the case, to take out and remove the said James Hamlet, the fugitive person aforesaid, back to the State of Maryland, whence he escaped as aforesaid. In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this 27th day of September, 1850

ALEX'R GARDINER.
U. S. Commissioner for the Southern District of New York

So the prisoner was removed, handcuffed, and started on his journey, the body-guard of the slave-hunter, Clare, being composed of Mr. Talmadge Jr., Mr. Wm. A. Brown, and another officer whose name we have not learned.

Now is there any such person as Mary Brown of Baltimore? If there is a Mary Brown, had she a slave by the name of James Hamlet? If so, was he a fugitive, or did he purchase his freedom, or was he emancipated, or brought to this city by his mistress and thus become by right free? Or if Mary Brown ever had a slave called James Hamlet, who fled from her service, was the man here called James Hamlet that man? Who are these men Clare and Brown, whose oaths—things to be purchased any day cheap in the purlieus of the Courts—are held sufficient to decide upon the dearest right of a citizen? Who can tell that this whole proceeding was not a cleverly arranged scheme to get hold of a likely, industrious colored man who could be sold for a thousand dollars to Hope H. Slaughter, or any other human-flesh-monger in Baltimore? Or granting the first steps in the case to be legal—that there is a Mary Brown—that she had a slave James Hamlet—that he ran away—that Clare is her authorized agent to take him—granting all this, and where is the evidence, that he has not taken the wrong man, and that this one, called Hamlet, is not a free-born citizen of the State of New York? Or finally granting all the whole proceedings are correct and legal in this case, what better evidence can we have than this that any man with a certificate and a Power of Attorney purporting to come from a slaveholder, may take any colored man he pleases before Commissioner Gardiner, and receive from him the authority, and from the Marshal the power to take the man so alleged to be a slave to any place between this and the Rio Grande that he may designate?

The tale is sad enough but there is a sadder ending. We learn, since the above was written, that *James Hamlet's wife died on Tuesday in convulsions produced by grief.*

BLACK AND WHITE CHURCHES.

The question of the admission of colored Churches to an equality with those which compose the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of New York came up again at the Convention of that Church last week in this city. It met with the usual success. Mr. Jay's indefatigable exertions in behalf of his colored brethren in the faith were without avail against the prejudices of the brethren who regard the mortal covering as a better test of Christianity than the character of the immortal soul within. We are no casuist, but it strikes us that, according to the tenets of the Episcopal Church theirs is a peculiar sin, above that of the other Churches in refusing fellowship to professing Episcopalians against whom no charge of immorality or irreligion can be brought. This sect, if we understand it, presumes itself to be *the* Church of Christ, and its ministers the Successors of the Apostles. The colored Churches of this denomination are Episcopalians or nothing. But how can they be Episcopalians if not in fellowship with the Church? And if not Episcopalians how can they be Christians? If none but Christians are inheritors of immortality, and none but Episcopalians are Christians, and none are Episcopalians who are not in fellowship with the Church, it is not a question of equality in the church simply, but of admission to Heaven itself. No doubt, however, some of those who refuse the admission of Colored Churches would be very glad if the question could be narrowed down to such a proposition, and have it settled on earth that the distinction they claim be maintained to all eternity

We copy the *Tribune's* report of the proceedings of the Convention on this subject.

COLORED CHURCHES.

MR. JAY then brought up the case of the Colored Churches of ST. PHILIP and the MESSIAH, and deprecated the former action of the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches, in refusing them admission to the Convention. Colored Churches had been admitted in Rhode Island, in New Jersey, and elsewhere. He thought it the duty of this Convention to meet the case before them fairly, and urged the Christian obligation of the Church to receive their colored brethren into fellowship. Mr. Jay reviewed the general merits of the case. He claimed admission for all colored Churches which had been duly organized and were qualified under the Constitution of the Convention—without any inquiry as to social inequalities. He read extracts from the Prayers of the Church, and drew a comparison between the sentiments of the Prayer-Book, comprising the great principles of the Church, and the practice which precludes true Christian fellowship. We should drive no sheep from our fold which desire to enter. It would be a base surrender of our principles, of our faith in the stability of the Church, to fear the voice of the world. Let us shake from us all unholy influences, and stand erect as Christians. Let us receive these parishes to our Convention; let us welcome them as Christians should welcome Christian brethren. He inquired whether the resolution of the majority of the Committee (prepared in a negative form, denying the application of the Churches) was not now before the Coonvention for its action?

An animated scene ensued upon the introduction of this vexed question.

Mr. HARISON demanded that the motion of the gentleman be reduced to writing.

Mr. JAY asked the opinion of the Chair.

The CHAIR had not decided, when

Mr. HARISON again hoped that if the matter were taken up, some time would be allowed for members to prepare themselves.

The CHAIR expressed the opinion that the Convention could not take up unfinished business which had so long passed unnoticed.

This opinion was sustained by Hon. Luther Bradish. Considerable discussion ensued upon points of order.

Mr. JAY then offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That this Convention do now proceed to consider the application for admission of the Church of St, Philip, New York, and the Church of the Messiah, New York, which were made to the body in the year 1846, and which were favorably reported upon by the Committee on the incorporation of Churches.

Mr. LIVINGSTON raised a point of order, as to the reception of the resolution at this time, on the ground of its interruption of the order of business.

The CHAIR asked how the Convention was to know whether the Churches ever desired admission? Four years had elapsed, and there had been no renewal of the application.

Hon. JOHN C. SPENCER, of Albany, opposed the reception of the resolution. He argued the necessity of a new application from the Churches.

Mr. JAY considered that the application, one made, continued in full force to the present time, without a renewal. He entreated the members of the Convention to put an end to the agitation, and act like men.

The CHAIR, however, decided that there was no application before the Convention, and that accordingly the motion of Mr. JAY was not in order.

Mr. JAY made an appeal from this decision.

Dr. HAWKS followed in support of the decision of the Chair, and hoped the Convention would abide by the written regulation of the Journal.

Mr. JAY then withdrew the appeal, but gave notice that he should take an early opportunity to renew the application of the Churches.

The subject was then dropped.

TROUBLE IN THE WHIG WIGWAM.

The Whigs took their turn at an insurrection at the Convention last week at Syracuse. It seems to have come upon them unexpectedly, and though its ostensible cause was a difference of opinion on the Slavery question, the real difficulty was no doubt a difference as to men and not measures, and one which may therefore, and probably will be easily healed. The Whig party which has assumed to be for several years past, while out of power, the Northern and Anti-Slavery party, has become, since it sat itself down among the money-bags, and with the baton in its hand, so eminently national and conservative, that it is quite absurd for it now to suffer local divisions on the great question which it has been settling for the last nine months at Washington, and has succeeded so entirely to the satisfaction of all concerned—except, indeed, a small minority, not worth mentioning, of a few millions at the South whose own lot is not so much effected, as the destiny of their posterity is fixed as far as human legislation can effect it, for generations to come. But though the question is settled, there was a very exasperated state of feeling existing among the Whigs assembled at Syracuse against Senator Seward, whom they could not forgive for having stood in the way, as he most unquestionably did, of the adjustment of all these national difficulties on the basis approved of by the party. There was, moreover, a foregone grudge held by the friends of Fillmore against the Senator, which of course only irritated the more recent hurt which their love of country—the *whole* country, by way of distinction, that is—had received. At the head of these aggrieved ones stood Mr. Wm. Duer, a member of Congress, who being quite sure of his pay at Washington, where he does not return another session, did not think the duties there so well worth attending to as those nearer home,—namely at the Whig Convention, where removal was yet to be striven for.

It is not necessary that we should go into all the details of the division of the Convention, further than to state that a series of Resolutions offered by Mr. Duer, as Chairman of a Committee, was not allowed to be pushed through on the reading, and that when time was given for consideration certain substitutes were adopted by a large vote, whereupon Mr. Duer and his friends, to the number of forty or fifty, withdrew and organized a new Convention, and of course a new party. We copy now the Resolutions that were superseded and those that were adopted, omitting the general Resolutions which appeared in both sets, and which merely asserted certain doctrines of undisputed Whigism, such as Tariff, Internal Improvements, &c., &c.

Mr. Duer's Resolutions. (*Superseded*—71 to 42)	Mr. Cornwell's Substitutes. (*Adopted*)
5. Resolved, That the Whigs of New York deeply lament the dispensation that removed from the sphere of his usefulness and honor our late lamented Chief Magistrate, whose purity of purpose, lofty patriotism, and devoted and self-sacrificing services and stern uncompromising resolution in the path of duty, had justly endeared him to his countrymen.	5. Resolved, That this Convention, respecting those who have sustained Whig principles with equal fidelity and consistency and adversity, rejoice in the opportunity now offered for making expressions of renewed confidence in the present National Administration and in the wisdom and efficiency with which it has been administered under circumstances of unusual embarrassment and difficulty.
6. Resolved, That the Whigs of this State have tried in various capacities the ability, the wisdom, the patriotism and devotion to the best interests of the country of Millard Fillmore, President of the United States, and that from the experience of the past and their knowledge of his private virtues, they repose the utmost confidence in his administration of the Government and his maintenance of the well-known principles of the Whig creed.	6. Resolved, That while we lament most deeply the irreparable loss of our Chief Magistrate, General ZACHARY TAYLOR, at a crisis in our country's history which his clear judgment and Roman firmness seemed so peculiarly designed to meet, we deem it most fortunate for the Nation that his place is filled by a successor so distinguished and capable as MILLARD FILLMORE, in whose experience, fidelity and enlightened statesmanship, the People of New York have learned to repose entire confidence.
7. Resolved, That while the Whig party of New York, remain unalterably opposed to the Extension of Slavery, over Territory now free, and have no doubt of the Constitutional power of Congress to prohibit such extension, a liberal spirit of toleration should be exercised in regard to conflicting opinions touching measures which have been adopted by Congress for the adjustment of the questions arising from our late territorial acquisitions: that we rejoice in the admission of California as a free State, and are prepared to acquiesce in the recent action of Congress for the settlement of the Boundary Line between New Mexico and Texas, and the creation of Territorial Governments for New Mexico and Utah, in the confident belief that these acts of conciliation will result in the exclusion of Slavery from the Territory ceded by Mexico to the United States, and at the same time tend to restore those cordial sentiments and fraternal ties which ought ever to be cherished between the different sections of our common country.	7. Resolved, That our thanks are especially due to the Hon. WILLIAM H SEWARD, for the signal ability and fidelity with which he has sustained in the United States Senate, those beloved principles of public policy so long cherished by the Whigs of the Empire State, expressed in State and County Conventions, as well as in the votes and instructions of our State Legislature. Those principles are eminently National and Republican because they are just and equitable.
8. Resolved, That the Whigs of New York, have confidence in the honest purpose and patriotic motives which animated the Whig Senator and Representatives from this State in the Federal Legislature, upon the embarrassing questions which have been agitated during the present Congress: that we recognize in their course and conduct an earnest desire to seek the permanence and advancement of the best interests of the Union; and although, in the conscientious discharge of their duty, they have felt constrained to adopt differing and antagonistic views, we admire the honesty and approve the candor and tolerance with which, upon exciting questions, they have nevertheless differed like brethren.	8. Resolved, That the Whigs of New York have confidence in the honest purposes and patriotic motives, which animated the Whig Representatives from this State in the Federal Legislature upon the embarrassing questions, which have been agitated in the present Congress.
	9. Resolved, That the admission of California into the Union as a State, and with a free constitution meets with our hearty approbation, and as Territorial Governments are established for New Mexico and Utah, without any prohibitory clause, on the assumption that Slavery is excluded by other causes, it is the solemn duty of Congress to extend the Jeffersonian Ordinance over these territories on the first indication that Slavery or involuntary servitude is likely to be introduced into them.
	12. Resolved, That we unanimously recommend the several candidates presented for the suffrages of the people, by this Convention, to the united and energetic support of the Whigs of New York, as men of distinguished abilities and worth, of unblemished public and private reputation, of tried fidelity to the principles of the Whig party, and as being eminently qualified in every respect for the discharge of the high and honorable trusts for which they have been this day selected.

The Young Whigs, it is said, are about to issue a State address, the character of which it is not difficult to conjecture, emanating as it will from men who are friendly to the measures opposed by Senator Seward, and opposed to those which he advocated, in relation to Slavery. They will speak, however, from an advantageous stand-point, for though in a minority in the State, they represent the national party, and are moreover on the side of the administration. There will be a "harmony Convention" next year, and by that time we shall be near enough to the next Presidential election to enable the Whigs to come to as amicable arrangement of all their difficulties as that just made between the Old Hunkers and Barnburners.

Abolition in the District.

Mr. Preston King, a Free Soil Representative from this State, arose in his place, on Tuesday of last week, and observing that he had been seeking throughout the session, for an opportunity to introduce a Bill for the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, but without success, he now moved a suspension of the rules to permit him to bring forward the following for the action of the House:

AN ACT to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That Slavery is hereby abolished and forever prohibited in the District of Columbia. All persons held in Slavery in the District of Columbia emancipated by this act, shall be paid for out of the Treasury of the United States, and the amount to be paid or value of each person so emancipated, shall be ascertained and determined by the Judge of the District Court for the District of Columbia.

The House, as was to be expected, refused to suspend the rules by a large vote—100 to 52. Four years ago Mr. King would have hardly had so large a vote against his expulsion for his temerity in making such a proposition as was given, in this case, for the proposition itself.

The vote is worth recording, and was as follows:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Alexander, Andrews, Bingham, Booth, Burrows, Joseph Cable, Calvin, Chandler, Clark, Cleveland, Cole, Corwin, Doty, Duncan, Burkee, Fitch, Fowler, Freedley, Goodenow, Gott, Gould, Grinnell, Halloway, Harlan, Hebard, Henry, Howe, Hunter, James G. King, John A. King, Preston King, Horace Mann, Matteson, Meacham, Moore, Ogle, Otis, Peck, Reed, Reynolds, Risley, Rockwell, Root, Rumsey, jr., Sackett, Schoolcraft, Silvester, Spalding, Sprague, Thadeus Stevens, Van Dyke, Vinton, Waldo, and White—52.

NAYS—Messrs, Albertson, Anderson, Ashe, Ashmun, Bay, Bayly, Beale, Bissell, Bowdon, Bowie, Bowin, Briggs, Brooks, Albert G. Brown, Buel, Burt, Chester Butler, Thomas B Butler, E. Carrington, Cabell, George Alfred Caldwell, Joseph P. Caldwell, Carty, Casey, Clingman, Williamson, R. W. Cobb, Daniel Dimmick, Disney, Dixon, Edmundson, Eliot, Alex. Evans, Nathan Evans, Featherston, Gilbert, Gorman, Green, Hall, Hammond, Hampton, Isham G. Harris, Sampson W. Harris, Thomas L. Harris, Hay, Haymond, Hibbard, Hoagland, Holladay, Holmes, Howard, Hubbard, Inge, Joseph W. Jackson, A. Johnson, Kauffman, Kerr, Geo. C. King, La Sere, Leffler, Littlefield, Job Mann, Marshall, Mason, McClernand, McDowell, McLanahan, Robert M. McLane, McMullen, McQueen, Meade, Miller, Millson, Morris, Morton, Orr, Outlaw, Parker, Peaslee, Phelps, Potter, Powell, Richardson, Robbins, jr., Robinson, Ross, Savage, Sawtelle, Seddon, Stanly, Richard H. Stanton, Alex. H. Stevens, Stetson, Strong, Taylor, Jacob Thompson, James Thompson, Venable, Walden, Wallace, Watkins, Wellborn, Whittlesey, Wildrick, Williams, Woodward, and Young—109.

In this connection it is proper to publish the Bill for the Suppression of the Slave Trade in the District, which, it will be remembered, has actually become the law of the land. This measure was one of those for which Abolitionist contended and petitioned for—a fact which it would be well for slaveholders and pro-slavery people to remember. It is the first thing *abolished*, —the first tumbling brick in the long row which the builders hoped to make stronger by adding more to. Doubtless the row will be the longer in falling, but that one end has moved should warn them that the whole must go, and the nearest bricks speedily. It may be remarked that this bill abolishes the thing of the least consequence that the Slave-Power could concede. But the important fact is that it *is* conceded.

AN ACT to suppress the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the first day of January 1851, it shall not be lawful to bring into the District of Columbia any slave whatever, for the purpose of being sold, or for the purpose of being placed in depot, to be subsequently transferred to any other State or place to be sold as merchandise. And if any slave shall be brough into the said District by its owner, or by the authority and consent of its owner contrary to the provisions of this act, such slave shall thereupon become liberated and free.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall and may be lawful for each of the Corporations of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, from time to time, and as often as may be necessary, to abate, break up, and abolish any depot or place of confinement of slaves brought into the said District as merchandise, contrary to the provisions of this act, by such appropriate means as may appear to either of the said Corporations expedient and proper. And the same power is hereby vested in the levy court of Washington county, if any attempt shall be made within its jurisdictional limits, to establish a depot or place of confinement for slaves brought into the said District as merchandize for sale contrary to this act.

Approved September 10, 1850.

The Boston Representative.

It has come to be considered so much a matter of course that a party-politician may be entirely depended upon for any villainy either great or small which the exigencies of party, or the mandates of the Slave-power might require, that it has ceased to excite surprise to see one of these gentlemen declare by his own act or word to-day the very opposite of what he did or said yesterday. Time was when one such act in a man's life would have left upon his political character a mark as deep and abiding as the "V" which the French police burn upon the shoulder of a thief; but that time was when parties had principles, and when public men considered their private honor compromised by dishonest public acts. But we have changed all that. To solemnly affirm a great moral principle, and pledge oneself to its maintenance, and then for the bribe of office or popularity in a class, abandon the right and support the wrong is an every-day thing. We may thank Slavery for this. The slaveholders buy and sell Northern representatives in Congress for the support of their system, as readily and almost as openly as they do the slaves for the cultivation of their plantations. And Northern people send their representatives there for that very purpose. Witness, for example, the vote of Mr. S. A. Eliot, of Boston, on the Fugitive Slave Bill He was sent to Congress by the Cottonocracy to get a new Tariff, and if the slaveocracy wanted his vote in return for anything, no matter what, they were to have it. It happens not unfrequently that these shameless bargains are never consummated, for a slaveholder is a bad paymaster, and does not always think it worth while to redeem his promise when by simply giving it he has got all he wanted. Mr. Eliot voted for the most infamous law that men ever dared to write upon the Statute Book. He ought to be well paid for it, and perhaps he may be by his masters in Boston, but they, at any rate, have got no Tariff yet. But see what this same man voted for a few months ago in the Massachusetts Legislature:

"*Resolved*, That the sentiments of the people of Massachusetts, as expressed in their legal enactments, *in relation to the delivery of fugitive slaves*, REMAIN UNCHANGED, and inasmuch as the legislation necessary to give effect to the clause of the Constitution relative to this subject, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, we hold it to be the duty of that body to pass such laws only, in regard thereto, as will be sustained by the public sentiment of the free States when such laws are to be enforced, and which shall especially secure to all persons whose surrender may be claimed as having escaped from labor and service in other States, THE RIGHT OF HAVING THE VALIDITY OF SUCH CLAIM DETERMINED BY A JURY IN THE STATE WHERE SUCH CLAIM IS MADE.

"*Resolved*, That the people of Massachusetts, in the maintenance of these their well-known invincible principles, expect that all their *officers and Representatives will adhere to them at all times, on all occasions, and under all circumstances.*"—[Acts and resolves of the Massachusetts Legislature for 1850.]

THE COLORED PEOPLE MOVING.—In Pittsburg Pa., so great is the panic among fugitive slaves that they have gone off by hundreds to Canada to avoid arrest. Here we are called upon daily for advice from persons whose cases present some peculiar features which give them reason to hope that they may be exempt from the common lot. The indignation and fear, however, are universal, one or the other preponderating according to circumstances. A meeting is to be held here this (Tuesday) evening, but we shall not be able to give the result in this week's paper.

☞ WE need not call attention to the article on the fourth page from the pen of our associate Mr. Quincy, though to enjoy it to the full it is well the reader should know that on the very day that this article appeared in the 'Boston Post,' 'Sigma' published in the 'Transcript' his promised second and most indignant philippic against the disturbers of the ashes of John Hampden!

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE BILL.

ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS,

By the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

MASSACHUSETTS FREEMEN AND WOMEN! Politicians and wordly men are just congratulating themselves that the much vexed question of Slavery is at rest, and that a compromise which is satisfactory to the moderate men of both sections of the country has been effected. They do not know, or have forgotten, that the law of the eternal God is right and truth. They do not know, or have forgotten, that any question, in order to be really settled, must be settled right. No *abiding* comprom

successful, and a certificate to that effect is granted him, whilst only five dollars is allowed them if they fail to see sufficient proof! Truly, it will be next to a miracle if, from such a class, not a few are found willing to become the tools of the oppressor.

The marshal and deputy marshals are obliged, under a penalty of $1,000, to receive and use all proper means diligently to execute all warrants and precepts directed to them; and if any fugitive, after being arrested, shall escape from the custody of the marshal or his deputy, no matter whether with or without their assent, the marshal may be compelled to pay the value of the slave by a suit on his official bond. And the better to enable the commissioners to execute their duties faithfully and efficiently, they are authorized, from time to time, to appoint as many persons to execute their warrants as they see fit to, with authority, if need be, 'to summon and call to their aid the by-standers or posse comitatus,' when necessary to insure a faithful observance of the law; and all good citizens are commanded to aid and assist in the prompt and efficient execution of the law, whenever their services may be so required.

Any slaveholder, or his agent or attorney, may legally, either with or without any warrant, as he may see fit, seize any citizen, or other person found in this State, and take him before any one of these commissioners, in any county, whom for any reason he may please to select, and claim the man as his slave. It then becomes the duty of the commissioner 'to hear and determine the case of such claimant in a *summary* manner.' There is to be no elaborate and careful sifting of evidence—no appointment of counsel to defend him. But the liberty of a human being is to be finally passed upon in a *summary* manner by a person who has more pecuniary interest to make him out a slave than he has to find him a freeman! And, in order to simplify the matter as much as possible, the law declares that the testimony of the alleged fugitive shall in no case be admitted, but at the same time points out a way in which the claimant can, by his own oath, or that of his agent, most easily fabricate *conclusive* evidence in support of his claim.

To obtain this evidence, a slaveholder may go before the judge of any court of record in his own State, and by ex parte testimony 'make satisfactory proof' to that judge of the escape of his slave; and thereupon a record is made of the matter so proved, "and also a general description of the person so escaping, with such convenient certainty as may be, and a transcript of such record, authenticated by the attestation of the clerk and of the seal of said court being produced' in Massachusetts, and exhibited to any of the above named judges or commissioners, 'shall be held and taken to be *full* and *conclusive* evidence of the fact of escape, and that the service or labor of the persons escaping is due to the party in such record mentioned. And upon the production by the said party of other and further evidence, if *necessary*, either oral or by affidavit, in addition to what is contained in the said record of the identity of the person escaping, he or she shall be delivered up to the claimant.'

The result of this provision, in nearly every case, must be, that the slaveholder, by his *own** oath, or, what is the same thing, that of his agents, taken wholly *ex parte*, and without being subjected to any close examination, may, through the process of a court record in his own State, prepare for use against citizens and residents *here*, *conclusive* evidence of the fact that a person of such a size, shape, and personal appearance, is his fugitive slave. But the daily experience of every reader must have already convinced him how frequently even entire strangers are mistaken for one another, even by intimate acquaintances of one of the parties. Over twenty persons were ready to testify, on oath, that they had seen Dr. Parkman in the streets, after the time when, as the result proved, his lifeless remains had been disposed of in the Medical College.

Now, what security have we, under this law, if the slaveholders' agent, with the authenticated record in his pocket, seizes the wrong man? Very little indeed—almost none! Suppose he meets a man in the street, whose appearance tallies, he thinks, with the description given in the record. He seizes him, and hurries him before that commissioner whose perceptions are most likely to be quickened by difference in his fees. If terror does not, the law does, close the mouth of the poor colored man. He may be an entire stanger in the place, and consequeutly unable to prove his freedom. He may, it is true, protest, on oath, before the commissioner, that he is a freeman, but the law pays no heed to his oath, though it fabricates conclusive proof out of that of the claimant. If the commissioner also thinks that the description in the record agrees with the appearance of the man before him, he may adjudge the production of any further proof of identity unnecessary, and grant the claimant a certificate that the man is his slave. He may, if he pleases, even refuse to hear a particle of evidence in favor of the victim, supposing the latter to be in a situation where he can procure any, which frequently must happen not to be the case. This certificate, *no matter how corruptly procured*, cannot possibly be legally impeached or set aside in any way The law declares that it shall be *conclusive* evidence of the right of the claimant to remove the alleged slave, and shall prevent all molestation of the claimant 'by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate or other person whomsoever.' The writ of habeas corpus—the writ of personal replevin—the right of trial by jury—all fall powerless before this 'certificate,' thus 'summarily' procured. The State is bound to protect its citizens, and yet there is no process known to the law which can avail the victim. Thus completely is the liberty of any citizen of this State placed at the mercy of any one corrupt or careless commissioner!

Suppose one of the many colored seamen and stewards (our own free born citizens) who have been, agreeably to Southern law, sold into Slavery for life in Charleston and other Southern ports, for venturing to exercise the right guarantied to them by the Constitution, should escape from Slavery, and once more breathe the free air of Massachusetts. There is not sufficient power in all the Commonwealth legally to prevent that man from being torn from the very spot of his birth, under the provisions of this law, and taken back to Slavery! The master would come here with the authenticated record which would constitute *conclusive* evidence of his Slavery and escape, and not even the testimony of the mother who bore him, of his wife and children, singly or combined, would shake in the slightest degree the conclusive character of the record. The identity of the man would be beyond doubt. It would be beyond all doubt that he was really a freeman. Even the commissioner might believe him to have been a native of this State; and yet, under the provisions of this law, we could not protect him from being carried back to Slavery! Our laws would be powerless! Whoever had the manliness to endeavor to aid him to escape, would expose himself to a fine of $1000 and six months imprisonment, and perhaps to a further claim of $1000, by way of civil damages to the claimant. It is *possible* that public opinion might be powerful enough to avail him, but it would avail him only by trampling the law under foot And this is not the kind of protection for the liberty of the citizen, which our State Constitution speaks of when it declares that each individual has a *right* to be protected by society in the enjoyment of his liberty, according to standing laws. Even this kind of protection, which public opinion might offer, the law of Congress guards against, as far as possible. In case the claimant makes affidavit that he has reason to apprehend a rescue by force, before he can take the fugitive beyond the limits of the State in which the arrest is made, it is made the duty of the officer to retain custody of the fugitive, and remove him to the State from whence he fled; and to do this, he is authorized to employ, at the expense of the United States, such a number of men as will be sufficient to overcome any rescuing force which may be brought.

Such are some of the *legal* objections which may be brought against this law. As we have seen, a regard for the fundamental principles of the Constitution, for the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence, required Congress, when enacting a law on this subject, jealously to guard the rights of citizens of the free States. Not only has Congress not done this, but it has passed a law, which places at the sole discretion of any one of a number of interested men, the liberty of any man in the Commonwealth, and which deprives the Commonwealth of all power to protect, in any way except by force of arms, the liberty of its own admitted citizens; a law which tramples under foot long acknowledged and fundamental principles of civil liberty, and those legal rules of evidence, the application of which the experience of centuries has demonstrated to be necessary to protect the personal rights of the individual.

But there are other and far higher and more important objections to this law, and the clause of the Constitution under which it was framed, than any or all of those which have been alluded to. Even if we could be perfectly sure that none but those who are legally slaves would be returned to bondage—even if it was capable of demonstration, that under this law and constitutional provision, the rights of every free citizen would be protected—still, it would be morally wrong to support these laws. Slaveholding is always wrong. It is wrong to hold any man in Slavery. It is wrong to return or aid in returning a fugitive slave. These things are wrong—the Constitution of the United States and law of 1850 to the contrary notwithstanding. Not all the constitutions and laws of the universe can make wrong in the slightest degree right. No one hesitates to deny the right of any one to hold *us* in Slavery.—Every one admits that if we were slaves, it would be right to escape if we could, and wrong for any one to force us back into Slavery. But if it is wrong for any one to enslave us, or to force us back into Slavery, it is just as great a wrong for us to enslave any one else, or to aid in returning any one else to Slavery. The soul of each man responds to the law of God—'Do unto others as ye would have them do unto you'—'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself'—and the slave who is toiling on a Southern plantation, and the slave who has manfully compassed his escape, are no less our neighbors than the friend whom we have known and loved from boyhood. God is the common Father of us all. All men, black as well as white, are brethren.

We cannot bring ourselves to believe that the Old Bay State is to become a hunting-ground for slaves. We will not believe that Massachusetts freemen will lend their aid to this monstrous inhumanity, until sad experience shall have demonstrated the fact. Who is there who is so heartless as not to be willing to succor and assist William and Ellen Craft? Where shall we find the man with soul so dead as to be willing to seize the heroic woman, Betsey Blakely, who, concealed on board ship, escaped from Wilmington, N. C.? Whose house and purse would not be opened to afford her shelter and protection against the slave-hunter? No! the law cannot be enforced in Massachusetts! It is contrary to the moral sense of the community, and the community will repudiate it. 'Pass enactments,' says the earnest-souled Henry Ward Beecher, 'enough to fill all the archives of the Senate, and your slave-catcher shall not budge an inch faster than he now does in the North. Every village will spurn him. Every yeoman along the valleys will run the slave, and trip the shameless hunter. Bread and shelter, protection and direction, will be the slave's portion north of Mason and Dixon's line, with more certainty and effect every year that elapses, until the day of emancipation.' * * * * 'It will be so, because, since the world began, the sympathies of common men have been with the weak and oppressed. In that sympathy, they have conformed to the fundamental law of humanity, which lies deeper in the consciousness of honest men than any national compact can ever go. Man cannot plant parchments as deep as God plants principles. The Senate of the United States is august; and such men as lead her counsels are men of might. But no man, and no Senate of men, when once the eyes of a community are open to a question of humanity, can reason and enact them back again to a state of indifference, and still less can they enlist them along with the remorseless hunters of human flesh. And of all the very men who will justify Mr. Webster's adhesion to the South, if a trembling woman, far spent with travel and want, holding her babe to her bare bosom, true in her utmost misery to motherhood, should timidly beg a morsel of bread, a place to sleep, or a night's hiding-place from a swift pursuer—is there one of them all who would hesitate what to do? Is there a New England village that would not vomit out the wretch that should dare harm the slave mother? There are thousands of merchants who will say Mr. Webster is right, who the next moment will give a fugitive slave a dollar to speed on with! There are thousands who will say we ought to stick to the Constitution, who, when the case comes, would sooner cut their right hand off than be a party to a slave's recovery.'

We cannot refrain from quoting one other extract from the same writer:—

"If the compromises of the Constitution include requisitions which violate Humanity, I will not be bound by them. Not even the Constitution shall make me unjust. If my patriotic sires confederated in my behalf, that I should maintain that instrument, so I will, to the utmost bounds of Right. But who, with power which even God denies to himself, shall by compact foreordain me to the commission of inhumanity and injustice? I disown the act. I repudiate the obligation. Never while I have breath will I help any official miscreant in his base errand of re-capturing a fellow-man for bondage. And may my foot palsy, and my right hand forget her cunning, if I ever become so untrue to mercy and to religion as not, by all the means in my power, to give aid and succor to every man whose courageous flight tells me that he is worthy of liberty! If asked, what then becomes of the Constitution, I reply by asking what becomes of God's Constitution of Humanity, if you give back a slave to the remorseless maw of servitude? I put Constitution against Constitution God's against man's. Where they agree, they are doubly sacred. Where they differ, my reply to all questioners—but especially to all timid Christian scruples—is in the language of Peter: '*Whether it be right, in the sight of God, to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye.*'"

Freemen of Massachusetts! Followers of Christ, the Redeemer! Believers in a higher law than that of man, even the unchangeable law of God! The hour has come to prove your unfaltering attachment to liberty—the sincerity of your religious profession—that you are not atheistical in heart! As citizens, it is your prerogative to question the constitutionality of any enactment of Congress, and, in case you are convinced of its illegality, to contest it, as such, till a final decision be made by the rightful judicatory. As moral and religious men, you cannot obey an immoral and irreligious statute, whether it be constitutional or otherwise, without forfeiting your character, and committing gross impiety. The edict of Nebuchadnezzar, setting up the golden image to be worshipped, on pain of the rebellious being cast into the den of lions, was just as obligatory as is the fugitive slave law of Congress. This law is to be denounced, resisted, disobeyed, at all hazards. Its enforcement on Massachusetts soil must be rendered impossible. The testimony against it must be so emphatic and universal, that no slave hunter will dare to make his appearance among us, and no officer of the Government presume to give any heed to it. The religious or political journal that refuses to record its protest against the law must be marked, exposed, and held up to popular abhorrence. In every city, town and village, the clergy, of all denominations, should be respectfully requested, by deputation or letter, to arraign the law from the pulpit as inhuman and immoral, and therefore null and void; and, should any shrink from the performance of a duty so clearly obligatory, let their names be published to the world, and handed down to posterity. Let a vigilance committee be appointed in every place, whose duty it shall be to succor and help, in every way, the fugitive slave. Let those who exercise the elective franchise send up such senators and representatives to the next Legislature as will be ready to give official expression to the deep detestation of the law of Congress which pervades the Commonwealth. Bear in mind, that laws which are contrary to public opinion are dead, though living on the statute book.

To his undying infamy, one of the representatives in Congress from this State—SAMUEL A. ELIOT, of Boston—voted for this cruel, illegal, unchristian enactment! It was the vote of one recreant to justice, humanity, and honor; and however a proud, corrupt, heartless aristocracy in the city may seek to screen him from condemnation, the people of the Commonwealth will never forget his base servility to the Slave Power.

In conclusion—though, at the present session of Congress, the cause of liberty has been most shamefully betrayed, there is no real ground for dismay or discouragement. 'The triumphing of the wicked is short.' The revolution which has for twenty years been steadily going on, is not to be stayed by any factitious victory or specious compromise, but shall assuredly accomplish its work in due time. As for the Southern traffickers in human flesh, and their Northern accomplices

'Ah! vainly they trust, in their arrogant pride,
They can turn back the truth in her conquerless tide,
While onward she rushes, majestic and free,
Like the Amazon's wave as it sweeps to the sea.

Let them bind, if they will, the swift clouds as they run—
The storm-bolt, the whirlwind, the tempest of hail—
Turn back the red light to its home in the sun—
Stay the ruin that rides on the wing of the gale!
But they never shall bind, with a tyrant's command,
The Spirit of Freedom gone forth in our land;
Or fetter the Truth, as she moves through the world,
With her hand to the sword, and her banner unfurled!"

In behalf of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society,

FRANCIS JACKSON, *President.*
EDMUND QUINCY, *Secretary.*

Domestic Correspondence.

From Our Boston Correspondent.

NO. LXVII.

THE ARGUMENT.—*Jenny Lind fever—The race of fools—Who beat and who were next—Preeminence of Boston—Mortification of New York—The buyers and not the tickets sold—Disgraceful consequence—The correspondent's disgust—He telleth of Peter Higgins and his friends—He mourneth over the failure of the plot—He affirmeth that there are a few survivors—Royal reception of her Majesty—The Swedish flag—What was written on the doorposts and the gates—Municipal Homage—Address of the Mayor and Aldermen—Ceremonial of the same—Knighthood—The Box on the Ear—How it was—Order of the Nightingale—Ornithologic emblemology—The Scrimmage—The Handbill—Sigma taketh it amiss—The Correspondent marvelleth—Sigma's generous vindication of an unworthy object—How it was done—Extraordinary privacy of Mr. Edmund Quincy—The Correspondent threateneth him—How Sigma annihilated him—Sponsorial error—The Hampden Hoax—Sigma's Blunder exposed—Sell or no sell—First fruits of Fugitive Bill—Meeting of fugitives here—Their proposed contribution to the English language of a new verb, &c., &c., &c.*

BOSTON, September 28th, 1850.

It is so long since I wrote to you that I scarcely remember where I left off. Wherever it may have been, I find myself now in the midst of the Jenny Lind fever, which broke out here with even more fury than it did with you. The absurd price given by Dodge, the vocalist, you have heard of. Though there was a long interval between him and the fools that followed nearest to him in the race, still the tickets sold at ridiculous prices. I suppose Boston enjoys the honor of having made the biggest fool of herself in this direction that the world has yet seen, "considering the size of the town." Nearly as large a sum was got for an audience of twenty-five hundred in the Tremont Temple, as for ten thousand in Castle Garden. New York, therefore, must hide her diminished head. I understand, however, that she is resolved to gird herself up anew in this glorious struggle and to make Boston, like Barnum, "Nowhere." I am happy to learn, however, that some of the speculators in tickets were *sold* instead of the articles they proposed to trade in, and that their adventures were closed at a loss of about one half the investment. In consequence of this, the best places sold this morning for the disgracefully low sum of five dollars and a half premium, or eight dollars and a half a ticket. I looked in at the auction to see the fun, but when I found how matters were going on, I retired in disgust.

There was a good story in circulation before the first auction which it is a pity could not have become history. "Si no e vero e ben trovato." If not true it well deserves to be so. It was said that the people doing business round Faneuil Hall Market had made up a purse to buy the first ticket for one Peter Higgins, a second-hand hat dealer, who keeps thereabouts. Their wish was to give precisely two hundred and twenty-five dollars and fifty cents (Genin having given $225 for his); but for the honor of Boston they were willing to go as high as five hundred dollars. You will appreciate the glory that would have redounded to our city, if a second-hand Boston hatter had eclipsed a first-hand New York one. But if there were any truth in the story, and if Peter Higgins were not a *myth*, the adventurers had not reckoned with their host in the matter of the folly of their fellow-citizens. It would have been an admirable burlesque on this extravagant folly, and was well worthy of success. I beg you would not suppose, (as you might if you had not been an editor too long to believe *all* that you see in the papers) that this distemper carries off every individual in the city. There are a few hundreds, here, as I suppose there may have been in New York, who are in the enjoyment of their usual health; perhaps a little heightened by witnessing the malady of their neighbours.

The Queen of Song has been received with royal honors, as was her due. Her apartments at the Revere House were newly furnished for the occasion, and the flag of Sweden floated from its battlements. Among other circumstances of magnificence, the handle of the lock of her door had the rather equivocally complimentary text engraved upon it, "he that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord!" As much as to say, if you will give money to the poor the Lord will raise up fools enough to make it worth your while! You will be happy to hear that the homage of the city in its corporate capacity was laid at the feet of Her Majesty in due form. Mr. Mayor Bigelow, accompanied by Aldermen Grant and Holbrook, performed this interesting duty. It is understood that they went in State, preceeded by the city Marshal on horseback, and with the Corporate Seal and the Keys of the City Hall, the Gaol and the House of Correction (Boston unluckily not being a walled city, these were all the keys they had at hand) borne before them. On being introduced into the Royal Presence our worshipful Chief Magistrate made an humble and appropriate address, which was graciously received. It was thought that the least Her Majesty could do in return for this demonstration of loyalty would be to inflict the honor of knighthood on the Civic Dignitary. But, strange to tell, instead of bestowing the *accalade*, or thump on the shoulder, which makes part of that ceremony, she fairly gave him a sound *box on the ear*. It happened on this wise. In the course of his address he said "it is not your superhuman musical endowments that has captivated our senses; 'tis your *unblemished private character* and"—here Queen Jenny interrupted him with the very pat questions—"What do you know of my private character? What *can* you know of my private character? S no better than other people. No better!" But possibly this may be the ceremonial in that realm of Demi-semi-quavers over which she reigns. And so, perhaps, our worthy Chief Magistrate will yet receive the insignia of the Order of the Nightingale; unless, indeed, she should think that some other bird in the range of ornithology might more fitly express her sense of his merits.

There has been a good deal of amusement hereabouts, for a few weeks past, in consequence of a small *Scrimmage* (if you will pardon the expression) into which you and I were unwittingly dragged. It arose from my penultimate letter in which I had given some account of an eminent person well known in these parts (being, "like Cerebus, three gentlemen at once") as the "Sexton of the Old School," "Sigma" and Lucius Manlius Sargent. Some malicious persons, it seems, not knowing how extensive is the circulation of the Standard, got out your Correspondent's letter in a handbill, which was widely circulated within the narrow public that cares for these things. Singularly enough, the person thus distinguished by your Correspondent and his own friends took it in snuff—which seemed strange, for two reasons: First, because he is a sworn enemy to tobacco in all its forms; and, secondly, because the handbill contained the very creamies of the cream (*la crême de la crême*) of his own articles against Garrison and his gang of disorganizers, in the proportion of three parts to two of mine. Such was the case, however, and he came out very strong in the Transcript in vindication of the character of one Edmund Quincy, of Dedham, to whom the authorship of that letter had been maliciously ascribed. It was a friendly act on his part, and only slightly modified by his calling that gentleman, although he acquitted him of this crime, and admitted he had always treated himself with civility and respect, "a fool and an ass," with a slight intimation that he was a lunatic into the bargain. You will scarcely believe it, but it is true that that individual (relying, doubtless, on the strict *incognito* which I have preserved in my letters) actually had the assurance to come out in the Post and claim my letter as his! Though I remember, now, that you rebuked his effrontery by copying his letter and the just censures of Sigma into the Standard. I remember no parallel piracy except that of the Englishman who copied out the Man of Feeling ,before Mackenzie acknowledged it, with erasures, interlineations and corrections, so that, it being found in his desk after his death, he had a brief reputation of having written it, until the real author settled the matter.

Now, I cannot be surprised that any man should be ambitious of the reputation of writing my letters. But I think any one possessed of this last infirmity of noble minds, in this direction, had better wait until he is beyond my reach, or I beyond reaching him. I can assure that person that I believe I know more about him than any body else; and if he provoke me, I may *Sigmatize* him, also. However, he was in good hands. If Sigma gave him the lie once, he did fifty times; and, as the crowning and crushing sarcasm of all, he, in the cruelest manner, persisted in calling him "Mr. Edmund" throughout. Surely, his godfathers and godmothers were much to blame in the matter of his nomenclature. Instead of "Manlius," they should have christened him "Junius!" However, it had its effect, yea, more than it was meant to have. Sigma merely said that "he thought he had killed him," while the mangled victim owned up to entire and utter annihilation. Barnum, when he was "*Nowhere*," was an Entity, as well as a Quiddity, alongside of him. He emerged, however, sufficiently far out of the gulf of non-existence to suggest to Sigma a slight error into which he had fallen, in his Sextorial capacity. He had enlightened the readers of the Transcript with a minute account of the disinterment of John Hampden by Lord Nugent, in 1828, for the purpose of ascertaining whether that patriot came to his death by a shot in the shoulder, from the enemy, or the bursting of his own pistol. He was very severe on his lordship for his proceedings in the premises, and intimated his opinion that he was so ashamed of them that he adhered to an account of the mode of Hampden's death in his "Memorials," which was contradicted by the condition of the body. Now, it so happened that the whole story was a pure and unmitigated hoax. Last Saturday morning Mr. Quincy came out in the Post with the proofs of this fact, and *in the afternoon*, by one of those felicitous coincidences which occur only once in a man's life, Sigma came out in the Transcript with the second part of his account of the fabulous disinterment, and annihilating poor Lord Nugent, for a thing that never happened, with his very best sarcasm and indignation, even as he had done the unlucky aspirant to your Correspondent's laurels! While the town was laughing over the *Sell* of the Sexton, with that good humor men always feel at seeing another disposed of in that manner, the outside of the Transcript was actually struck off, and beyond recall, containing this most comical clinching of the nail that had been driven in a sure place, in the morning! Last Tuesday, Sigma "acknowledged the corn," as to the hoax, but denied that he was "*Sold*"—an opinion in which I believe he stood quite alone among his fellow citizens.

To come down to serious things. I see that the first fruits of the infernal Slave-hunting bill have been borne in your city. I think that Bill of Abominations is exciting a deeper and deeper disgust and abhorrence, as it is becoming more known and better understood. The fugitives here hold a meeting to-night to consider what they had better do. I think they will conclude that there is no safety for them this side of Victoria's Canada. It is said that they propose adding a new verb to the English vocabulary to describe this new phase of crime, and to say that a slave seized under this law is ELIOTED, in honor of the Representative of Boston, the most marked Northern man that helped to make it. If you think it appropriate and expressive, you can pass it round.—D. Y.

Miscellanea.

OSSIAN E. DODGE, Vocalist, bought the first ticket to Jenny Lind's Concert, in Boston, for Six Hundred and Twenty-five dollars.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE.—The twenty-third annual fair of this association was opened at Castle Garden on the 1st inst.

THERE are five sisters in Cambridge, near Boston, who can only sing when in a mesmeric state, and then they are said to sing with great sweetness and power. The Boston Journal says "their music, while in the state of trance, induced by Dr. Cutter, is superior to any thing we have ever heard in the normal state."

A DEMOCRATIC State Convention in Michigan nominated General Cass as a candidate for the Presidency in 1852.

THE Grand Jury of Philadelphia have indicted the Fire Department of that city as a nuisance, and call upon the city authorities to have it abated, meantime urging the citizens to refuse all donations to independent or volunteer companias.

THE DIRECTION OF A LETTER.—The following superscription is copied by the post from a letter now in the post office in this city. "Mr. James franke H. White hall st to be forwarded to paul ruttle and him to Wiliam shanahan and from him to Bridget Heanagan New York."

VERMONT FOR UNIVERSAL PEACE.—The People of Vermont are preparing to send a Mammoth Memorial to Congress and the President in favor of Universal Peace, on the basis recently suggested at the Frankfort Peace Convention. This form is as follows:

To the President of the United States:

The undersigned, legal voters in Vermont, deploring the evils of WAR, and desirous of the adoption of measures leading to the peaceable adjustment of all international difficulties, respectfully request you to propose to all nations the establishment of a Board for the settlement of all international disputes or claims.

FUGITIVE SLAVES.—We learn that Orlando Hastings, Esq. has been appointed by Judge Gridley a Commissioner under the law for the re-capture of fugitive slaves If the slave-catchers should come so far from home as this city, seeking for their victims, we know of no one who will scrutinize their claims more closely, or with a more humane desire to shield the colored man, than the newly appointed Commissioner.—Roch. Dem.

—If the appointment of Slave-catching Commissioners has commenced, we have a candidate whose claims can hardly be surpassed. We allude to Hon. James K WHITING, whose speech at Castle Garden last winter cannot have been forgotten so soon. Though not a Whig, he is eminently 'National,' and, 'Conservative,' and eminently faithful to 'the Compromis of the Constitution.' We shall insist on his having the first appointment for this city.—*Tribune.*

THE ATLAS of this city in speaking of the Fugitive Slave Bill says. That infamous and degrading bill has passed both houses of Congress; but, thank God, there was but one man in the whole New York delegation, in the House of Representatives, and but one in the Senate who was sufficiently debased to vote for it—to vote for the degradation of the great State of New York. The representative is named Hiram Walden—the Senator is named Daniel S. Dickinson. Let both be remembered—let them be.

"Exalted o'er their less abhor'd compeers,
And fester in the infamy of years."

LARGE GOLD COINS.—Senator Gwin has brought forward a measure providing that gold coins of the value of from one hundred to ten thousand dollars shall, be struck at the Mint. They are to be rectangular, suitable for packing, being designed for commercial purposes They are to be struck of refined gold of uniform fineness and with appropriate legends and devices similar to those upon our smaller coins, with their values conspicuously marked and the inscriptions *Liberty* and *United States of America*. Counterfeiting and mutilation are provided against by suitable contrivance and penal enactments.

FROM AFRICA.—We are indebted to a commercial house in this city for the following extract from a letter received by them.—*Com. Adv.*

SIERRA LEONE, Africa, Aug. 2d. 1850.

The British brigantine-of-war, Bonetta, arrived yesterday from the leeward coast, and will leave for England direct this afternoon, with information that the King of Dahomy has ordered the missionaries and recaptured slaves at "Understown" to leave the country before the 1st of October. If they do not, he says that he will behead them all, commencing with the missionaries. Commander Forbes, of the Bonetta, had an interview with the King, and the result was the immediate departure of the vessel for England.

THE Western Baptist Association, at its recent meeting in Newman, Ga. adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That in view of the alarming political agitations of our country, we recommend that the second Friday (the 18th) of November next, be observed by the churches composing this body, as a day of humiliation, fasting and prayer, that the Lord may be graciously pleased to guide the rulers and people of our land to wise, just and peaceful measures, to restore harmony and quietude to our borders, and make us ever to dwell under the shadow of his wings, a united and prosperous nation.

Resolved, That we respectfully and earnestly request the churches of our denomination generally, and all Christian denomination throughout the whole country East, West, North and South, to concur with us in the observance of the above named day.

Resolved, That a notice of this recommendation be immediately inserted in as many of the public prints as practicable, and that other papers throughout the country, religious and secular, be requested to copy ths same

A WHITE BOY KIDNAPPED BY A NEGRO.—A few days since a young man, about 20 years of age, went to the Police Office of the Third Municipality, and stated that when he was about 12 years old he was kidnapped from this city by a free colored man named De Lisle, and by him taken to Attakapas, where, until a short time ago, he was made to work among negroes as a slave The young man said that his name was Adolph Archer; that his parents were residing in this city when he was taken away; that he had a brother named Henry, and that the person who kidnapped him now resides about twelve or thirteen miles from New Iberia in this State. He further says that during the time that he was on the plantation he was, in every respect, treated as a negro slave, and seduously shut out from all intercourse with white persons, until he embraced an opportunity to escape. The story of Adolph's wrongs having been to some extent made public in the Third Municipality, came to the ears of his brother Henry, who sought out the long-lost Adolph and welcomed him to the endearments of a home. Henry is now employed in the office of the Swiss Consul, and is, as we learn, determined to seek out and bring to justice the blackhearted kidnapper of his brother.—[N. O. Delta.

MURDER IN CHESTER COUNTY.

Correspondence of the Pennsylvanian.

West Chester, Chester Co. Pa. Sunday, Sept. 29.

Dear Sir:—The community hereabouts has been thrown into a state of excitement at the perpetration of a murder, unparalleled almost in the annals of human atrocity. The circumstances are briefly these:—Phebe Sharpless, a daughter of Aaron Sharpless, near Hamorton, in this county, has been teaching school near Rocky Hill, near three miles east of this place, and yesterday morning, about 8 o'clock, as the scholars began to assemble at the school, they discovered her lying lifeless, having been shot in the back part of the neck, so as to cause instant death. The wadding of the gun was lying near by, and the person who perpetrated the deed must have been secreted behind a walnut tree, which stands about 35 or 40 feet in front of the door. She was a young woman about 20 years of age, of high respectability. A person has been arrested this morning, by Sheriff Darlington and posse, supposed to be the murderer, (his name is George Pharaoh,) and circumstances tend strongly to fix it upon him, as he has been seen frequently about this place, and the wadding of the gun corresponds with a number of the Saturday Evening Post, found about his person. He denies having anything to do with the perpetration of the murder, but says that he was out gunning, and was at no time nearer the school-house than a certain fence, about a quarter of a mile distant.

THE FIFTEENTH

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

To be held in Philadelphia on the 17th, 18th 19th, and 20th of December, 1850.

THE Managers of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Fair invite all those who, in previous years, have labored with them, and others interested in the promotion of the cause of Freedom to aid them in the work of preparation for their Fifteenth Annual Fair. The time demands earnest words and deeds. The present is not a season for loitering, or for rest. Our whole nation, from its centre to its remote circumference, is roused from a long and deep lethargy, and the great question of Slavery is about to be decided. In such a crisis the friends of Freedom cannot be too earnest or too busy in their efforts to disseminate their principles. There is no time to be lost. We therefore urge all such to unite heartily and zealously with us in the use of this well-tried and proven instrumentality for the promotion of the Anti-Slavery Cause.

Sarah Pugh,	Sarah T. Child,
Anna M. Hopper,	Anna M. Child,
Emily A. Winslow,	Huldah Justice,
Margaret Forten,	Harriet D. Purvis,
Mary Grew,	Theresa K. Hallowell,
Martha Carman,	Hannah W. Haydock,
Janette Jackson,	Elizabeth Gay.
Rebecca Plumley,	Priscilla Lukens,
Emma Parker,	Hannah L. Stickney,
Maria M. Davis,	Mary P. Stickney,
Sarah A. McKim,	Sarah M. Douglass,
Margaret A. Griscom,	Esther Reckless,
Margaret Jones,	Elizabeth Davis,
Elizabeth Carman,	Clementine G. Ruby,
Mary Shaw,	Gertrude K. Burleigh,
Elizabeth Clendenen,	A. Matilda Cassey,

THE ONE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS,

HELD PURSUANT TO A RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE RECENT N. ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION,

Will continue with meetings at the following named places:

SOUTH SCITUATE (Plymouth Co.),
Sunday, October 6.

To be held in connection with the quarterly meeting of the Old Colony Anti-Society Society, and will be attended by S. S. FOSTER, NATHANIEL H. WHITING, and others.

UPTON (Worcester Co.),
Sunday, October 13.

This Convention will be held in Waverly Hall, at the usual hours of meeting, and will be attended, probably, by SAMUEL MAY, JR., STEPHEN S. FOSTER, and CHAS. C. BURLEIGH. [See Handbills.]

A CONVENTION

Will be held at WORCESTER, Mass. on the 23d and 24th of October next, (agreeably to the appointment of a preliminary meeting held at Boston, on the 30th of May last,) to consider the question of WOMAN'S RIGHTS, DUTIES and RELATIONS; and the Men and Women of our country, who feel sufficient interest in the great subject to give an earnest thought and effective effort to its rightful adjustment, are invited to meet each other in free conference, at the time and place appointed.

The upward-tending spirit of the age, busy in a hundred forms of effort for the world's redemption from the sins and sufferings which oppress it, has brought this one, which yields to none in importance and urgency, into distinguished prominence. One-half of the race are its immediate objects, and the other half are as deeply involved, by that absolute unity of interest and destiny which nature has established between them.

The neighbor is near enough to involve every human being in a general equality of rights and community of interests; but, Men and Women, in their reciprocities of love and duty, are one flesh and one blood—mother, wife, sister and daughter come so near the heart and mind of every man, that they must be either his blessing or his bane. Where there is such mutuality of interests, such an interlinking of life, there can be no real antagonism of position and action. The sexes should not, for any reason, or by any chance, take hostile attitudes toward each other, either in the apprehension or amendment of the wrongs which exist in their necessary relations; but they should harmonise in opinion and co-operate in effort, for the reason that they must unite in the ultimate achievement of the desired reformation.

Of the many points now under discussion and demanding a just settlement, the general question of Woman's Rights and Relations comprehends such as:—Her EDUCATION, *Literary*, *Scientific*, and *Artistic*;—Her AVOCATIONS, *Industrial*, *Commercial*, and *Professional*;—Her INTERESTS, *Pecuniary*, *Civil*, and *Political*; in a word—her RIGHTS as an *Individual*, and her FUNCTIONS as a *Citizen*.

No one will pretend that all these interests, embracing, as they do, all that is not merely animal in a human life, are rightly understood or justly provided for in the existing social order. Nor is it any more true that the constitutional differences of the sexes, which should determine, define and limit the resulting differences of office and duty, are adequately comprehended and practically observed.

Woman has been condemned, from her greater delicacy of physical organization, to inferiority of intellectual and moral culture, and to the forfeiture of great social, civil and religious privileges. In the relation of marriage, she has been ideally annihilated, and actually enslaved in all that concerns her personal and pecuniary rights; and even in widowhood and single life, she is oppressed with such limitation and degradation of labor and avocation as clearly and cruelly mark the condition of a disabled caste. But, by the inspiration of the Almighty, the beneficent spirit of reform is roused to the redress of those wrongs. The tyranny which degrades and crushes wives and mothers, sits no longer lightly on the world's conscience—the heart's home-worship feels the stain of stooping at a dishonored altar—Manhood begins to feel the shame of muddying the springs from which it draws its highest life; and Womanhood is everywhere awakening to assert its divinely chartered rights, and to fulfil its noblest duties. It is the spirit of reviving truth and righteousness which has moved upon the great deep of the public heart, and aroused its redressing justice; and, through it, the Providence of God is vindicating the order and appointments of his creation.

The signs are encouraging; the time is opportune Come, then, to this Convention It is your duty, if you are worthy of your age and country. Give the help of your best thoughts to separate the light from the darkness. Wisely give the protection of your name and the benefit of your efforts to the great work of settling principles, devising the method, and achieving the success of this high and holy movement.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Lucy Stone,	William L. Garrison,
Wm. H. Channing,	Helen E. Garrison,
Harriet H. Hunt,	Charles F. Hovey,
A. Bronson Alcott,	Sarah Earle,
Nathaniel Barney,	Abby K. Foster,
Eliza Barnay,	Dr. —— Rogers,
Wendell Phillips,	Eliza F. Taft,
Ann Greene Phillips,	Dr. A. C. Taft,
Adin Ballou.	Charles K. Whipple,
Anna Q. T. Parsons,	Mary Bullard,
Mary E. Cabot,	Emma C. Goodwin,
B. S. Treanor,	Abby Price,
Mary M. Brooks,	Thankful Southwick.

RHODE ISLAND.

Sarah H. Whitman,	George Clarke,
Thomas Davis,	Mary Adams,
Paulina W. Davis,	George Adams,
Sarah Brown,	Joseph A Barker,
Elizabeth Chase,	John L. Clarke.
Mary Clarke,	

NEW YORK.

Gerrit Smith,	Elizabeth Russell,
Nancy Smith,	Stephen Smith,
Elizabeth Stanton,	Rosa Smith,
Catharine Wilkinson,	Joseph Savage,
Samuel J. May,	L. N. Fowler,
Charlotte C. May,	Lydia Fowler,
Charlotte G. Coffin,	Sarah Smith,
Mary G Taber,	Charles D. Miller.
Elizabeth S. Miller,	

PENNSYLVANIA.

William Elder,	Lucretia Mottt,
Sarah Elder,	Sarah Pugh,
Sarah Tynd

Miscellany.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BOSTON POST.

THE SEXTON SOLD!

SIR: At the close of a letter to the Editor of the *Transcript*, which you did me the favor to publish last week, after he had declined to insert it, I intimated that there was another matter relating to Sigma, though not to myself, which I should perhaps make the subject of a future communication. This I now propose, with your permission, to do. Before entering upon it, however, allow me to say, a single word to that editor. He charges me in his paper of the 13th with disingenousness and want of candor because I did not publish his letter of refusal. I cannot see that I was called upon to do so. I certainly could have had no objection, had I supposed he wished it to be done, excepting that I had asked already for as much of your space as I could reasonably expect you to give me. Neither do I see that he has taken himself out of the range of my censure by his reasons, which are substantially those of his letter. He says I chose my organ for my "attack on Sigma, and he his for his reply." My "attack" was a half serious exposition of the claims of Sigma to judge and condemn men, whatever may be their heresies or faults, quite as good as himself. I made game of him, undeniably, but I laid no charge against him, excepting the one proved before the police court. Had he confined himself to the same style of warfare, I should never have troubled the *Transcript*. But he accused me in his reply, through three mortal columns, of *lying;* which, if I am not mistaken, is yet regarded (unless it be in politics) as a serious imputation upon a gentleman's character. I do still think, sir, that I was entitled, in fairness, to a hearing before the same public to which the accusation had been addressed. The editor is mistaken in supposing that any of the "organs" in which my letter appeared, over which I have any influence, would have refused admission to Sigma's reply. Either of them would have readily published it, had it been sent to them; and, I dare say, will do so as it is. But enough of this.

You are probably aware, sir, that the eminent person we have in hand, like numerous other ingenious members of society, is known by more names than one. One of these *aliases*, as perhaps you know, is a "Sexton of the Old School;" in which capacity he has, for an incredible length of time, served up for the delectation of those relishing such ghoul-like repasts the *disjecta membra* (as he himself might say) of sundry and divers defunct people and events, disinterred by him for the purpose. I must needs confess, sir, that I have not often partaken of them myself, not fancying either the meat or the cook, let the sender of the one or the other be whom it might. Or, to mix the metaphor a little, the specific gravity of his articles had rather a repelling than an attractive power over so volatile a body as myself. But one afternoon last week as I peeped tremblingly at the fourth page of the *Transcript* with a fearful looking for of the judgment which the editor had announced as impending over me, my eye fell upon the Sexton's Dealing for the Day with the Dead, and my spirit returned unto me. I inwardly exclaimed, (I trust you will pardon the freedom of the expression) "The Lord hath delivered him into my hand!" And, without a moment's hesitation, I disbursed the two cents which were to make me its lawful and fortunate possessor.

In the contribution to the stock of the intelligence of the readers of the *Transcript* made that day by the Sexton, he gave an account of the disinterment of the famous John Hampden, as he says and italicizes, "in 1828 *under the direction and in the presence of Lord Nugent*," and expressed a variety of opinions touching that noble lord's conduct in the premises. I must make some quotations at considerable length, but I think I can assure you they will well repay the reading. He openeth as follows:

"In 1828, the body of Hampden was disinterred, *under the direction and in the presence of Lord Nugent:* and, when he published his memoir of Hampden, in 1831, I bought a copy to assist me in my professional studies, not doubting that it contained a particular account of the disinterment. Such an account would certainly have given additional interest to the memoir, and might, at least, have found a place in the appendix; but not even an allusion to the disinterment appears in Lord Nugent's memoir, published in two volumes, 1831, nor in the second edition, of 1832. This appeared quite unaccountable, until I fell upon a passage, in the *London Quarterly Review*, vol. 47, page 515, in which the writer, after questioning the sufficiency of the professed object to justify the disinterment of Hampden's remains, and especially condemning the manner in which that disinterment was effected, inclines to the opinion that Lord Nugent himself was moved by these very considerations to say nothing of the transaction in his memoirs.

"Mere mortal curiosity can never afford sufficient justification for any disturbance of the ashes of the dead: and, when adequate reasons for disinterment are at hand, the process should be conducted with the strictest regard to decency. In the disinterment of John Hampden's remains, there was something, which the very coarsest members of our profession will admit to be 'rough handling;' and it appears to me, that the motives assigned for the posthumous examination of the body, upon this occasion, were not less exceptionable even than the manner in which it was conducted."

After stating the two differing accounts of the manner of Hampden's death, he proceeds thus:

"The avowed object of the disinterment of Hampden's remains was to ascertain, if possible, in which of these two ways he came to his death. Lord Nugent sought and obtained the necessary permission; presided at the examination; descended into the vault, &c.; aided and assisted, by his acquiescence at least, in cutting off the dead man's arm, '*with a penknife*,' for a closer inspection—in prying up the corpse '*with a shovel*,'—and in taking hold of the hair, which was long and perfect, in such a way, that it came off, skull cap and all, '*like a wig*.' If one of our sextons should presume to deal with the very humblest of the dead, as my Lord Nugent appears to have dealt with John Hampden, he would deserve to run the gauntlet of the brotherhood, armed with cross-bows."

He next marveleth as to "what species of evidence Lord Nugent requires," and states that he says Hampden "was shot in the shoulder with two carabine balls." After a little, he goes on:

"If we take this account for evidence and I can conceive of no good reason why we should not—Lord Nugent, when he published his memoirs, must have known all that was known to the writer in the Monthly Magazine, for both were present at the disinterment. This fact must, inevitably, cast discredit on his statement as to the manner of Hampden's death. For, as a certain result of the post mortem examination, Lord Nugent must have known that the bones of the shoulder were neither '*broken*' nor '*shattered*.'

* * * * *

"Lord Nugent not only found the shoulder bones unbroken, but, on lifting the right arm, he discovered that the hand *was detached*, the bones of which were found *wrapped up, in a separate piece of cere-cloth*. The end of the arm appeared to have been *severed from the hand, by a saw*. All this, the relator observes, who, as I stated, was present with Lord Nugent and others, satisfied them all of truth of Sir Robert Pye's account. Yet, three years after, Lord Nugent published his book; adhered to the old story of 'the shattered shoulder' and the carabine balls; and said not a syllable of the disinterment!"

Now, sir, there was an excellent good reason why Lord Nugent should not have mentioned this interesting transaction in his "Memorials of Hampden," nor yet in the appendix thereof, yea, and why he should have "said not a syllable of the disinterment," at any time, if it so pleased him. And that was, because *no such disinterment ever took place!* Because the whole story was a *humbug*. A MYSTIFICATION, A HOAX!!

The Sexton is in error when he says, "the account of the disinterment has never been called in question." If I do not much misremember it was strongly doubted in the very next number of the Gentleman's Magazine to that in which it appeared. At any rate it was flatly contradicted by Lord Nugent himself in 1832. Why he did not contradict it sooner I do not know. Very likely because he did not think it necessary to notice an anonymous statement containing such intrinsic marks of improbability. One would have thought that the fact of his not mentioning it in his "Memorials" was an all sufficient contradiction of it. I think nothing short of the sagacity of our Sexton or of the rabid toryism of that bitter and unscrupulous partizan, Robert Southey, would have discovered in his silence a willful and most insane attempt to falsify history in order to cover up a discreditable action of his own.

When the very unfair and one-sided review of the "Memorials" in the Quarter (July, 1832,) appeared, to which the Sexton refers, Lord Nugent felt himself called upon to notice it. This he did in a pamphlet of 16 pp., entitled "A letter to John Murray, Esq., touching an Article in the last Quarterly Review on a book entitled,' &c., published by Murray in 1832. Among other things he refers to this story. He calls it "a very silly, distasteful narrative of a supposed very ghastly transaction, taken from the Gentleman's Magazine, and supposed to have been written by me, or under my authority. Not it, indeed." He says, "I certainly did see, in 1828, while the chancel of Hampden Church was repairing, a skeleton—which I have many reasons for believing was *not John Hampden's*, but that of some gentleman or lady who died a quiet death in bed,—certainly with no wound in the wrist." He thus accounts for its appearance in the Gentleman's Magazine—"from his innocent fondness for 'twaddling intelligence' Sylvanus was hoaxed. He swallowed with delight the bait and made the treacherous gift immortal as himself." His lordship's letter is caustic and severe, as well it might be; but it contains one or two ideas which it would do the Sexton no harm if he laid them to heart. For example—"What remains of Mr. Southey's article is mere abuse,—terms partaking of that figure of speech called *balderdash*." "Now, my dear Murray, nicknames" (and, *a fortiori*, hard names,) "are full as bad evidence of good reasoning as of good manners. And, as for mere thundering invective, that is a weapon which every man may find ready to his hand for the mere pains of stooping for it."

Mr. Southey took his time to reply, but when he had got his battery into position he let fly to some purpose. Lord Nugent, as you know, notwithstanding his descent from our old enemy George Grenville is a whig of the most liberal stamp. He had just been assisting at the consummation of the reform bill, which had thrown Southey and all his tribe into transports of consternation and rage. He had dared, too, to defend himself from an assault of the autocrat of the Albemarle-street dynasty. Smarting under these public and private injuries, Mr. Southey in his turn addressed a 'Letter to John Murray, Esq., *touching*' Lord Nugent, in reply to a letter from his lordship touching an article in the Quarterly Review; by the author of that article," published by Murray, in 1833. For keenness of sarcasm, unscrupulousness of statement and wickedness of wit, it would have done no discredit to Junius himself. Through more than seventy pages he pursues his antagonist with a rage and malice such as our Sexton may be capable of feeling, but with weapons and skill which he would aspire in vain to use. There is as much difference between them in these respects, as between the Admirable Crichton fencing at Mantua and a scavenger throwing mud in the streets. But, as far as the story now in question is concerned, Mr. Southey admits, though with no very good grace, that he also had fallen into the pit that had been digged for the ancient of St. John's Gate. "The result of inquiries," he says, "which Lord Nugent's letter has induced me to make is, that search was made for the body of Hampden; that several coffins were inspected but not opened, except one; *but this was not John Hampden's.*"

Now, sir, in view of the actual state of the facts, can anything be more delicious than the self-complacent suggestions of the closing paragraph of the Sexton:—

"He may have felt some compunction for having been particeps in such a bungling piece of post mortem butchery. But I am not satisfied with this explanation, which is suggested in the Quarterly Review. Let me offer another suggestion. Lord Nugent's book, published in 1831, may have been written in 1828. At any rate, the opinions advanced therein on several leading points were doubtless frequently expressed and maintained by him in various companies (!)—the *vestigia restrorsum* are seldom agreeable: and so, after allowing three years for the affair of the disinterment to fade away, out came the book (!!). Three years were too few—*bonum prematur in annum* is the true Horatian rule, and then his lordship would perhaps have thought better of it (!!!). In our next the reader shall judge of the evidence for himself."

"Here's richness" indeed, compared with which the ribs of Wackford Squeers were even as those of the lean kine of Pharoah!

Now I apprehend if I ever indulged in those felicities of diction which flow with such ease from the pen of Sigma I have quite as much ground to apply them to him, as he had to accuse me of saying "the thing that is not," to use the periphrasis of the Houyhnhms, in my *Standard* letter. But I acquit him of all intention to deceive in the premises. I believe it to be a case of good, honest, downright ignorance. But how can he expect again to astonish by his displays of curious and accurate information those venerable ladies (whether in petticoats or in pantaloons) to whose tea-tables the *Transcript* is as essential an adjunct as the toast or muffin—who depend upon it, in the evening, for their facts, as they do upon the *Daily Advertiser* in the morning for their opinions? If they happen to have learned Gray's Elegy by heart in childhood, (as I did) they doubtless know that such a man as Hampden once lived; though they may perhaps not know much more about him than a certain orator I wot of who had contracted a habit of bringing that unhappy patriot, without mercy, *to the block!* What dismay must overspread that most respectable public when they discover that their Sexton is not infallible! What confusion must needs settle down upon their souls as they endeavor to discriminate between truth and error in that mass of facts with which he has been so long overwhelming them!

"O, how hast thou with jealousy infected
The sweetness of affiance?"

He will have much to answer for if any, or all of them descend to their graves (dug in part, perhaps, by himself) with their poor brains irretrievably muddled.

I have said that I believe the Sexton was quite innocent of the knowledge of what I have been telling, at the time he wrote. I am not quite so sure, however, that he has remained without suspicion of it up to this day. I rather incline to think that "some d—d good-natured friend" has been swift to let him know how he had been "*sucked in*," (if you will pardon an idiom rather expressive than elegant) and to furnish him with the documents. I have two reasons for thinking so. First, because he has not yet redeemed his promise of a second article on the subject (for which I have been impatiently waiting) expressed at the close of his first, as above. Now, sir, considering the malignant type of that incontinence of ink under which he has labored for so many years, it must be something out of the common course that has stayed an access of his disorder for so long a time. It can hardly be owing to my humble labors in his behalf. I have, I thank God, a tolerably good opinion of myself and we all

"Know there are lines, that, fresh and fresh applied,
Will cure the arrant'st puppy of his pride;"

but I can hardly think, in view of how short a time I have had it under treatment, that I can have affected a radical cure in so very chronic a case. My second reason for this opinion is a curious analogy between one of Sigma's compliments to me in his contemporaneous reply to my letter, published by you, and one of Mr. Southey's to Lord Nugent. It may have been merely a coincidence of between two celebrated authors—a new occasion for the well grounded "curse upon those that have said our good things before us." If my hypothesis be correct, Sigma certainly has treated Mr. Southey's thoughts, as Sir Fretful Plagiary says, as "gypsies do stolen children—disfigure them to make them pass for their own." I will give the two passages that you may observe for yourself the resemblance, and also *the difference*, between the two. Sigma says "the anguish of this writer (your humble servant, to wit) resembles that of one of our yellow wasps, that writhes about quiet as energetically as it it had the power to sting." Mr. Southey says—"But Lord Nugent has no sting. In his endeavors to sting Mr Southey he resembles a great bluebottle fly, who buzzes about as it he fancies that he had one, and meaning to be formidable, succeeds only so far as to render himself offensive." Now, sir, I call you to witness that I do not affirm that Sigma ever saw or heard of this passage. It may be a pure coincidence; for, as we used to say on the leapingground in the gymnasium, "great wits *jump*." So I think you will agree with me that it will be quite sufficient if Sigma give me the lie *ten times* for making the suggestion.

But though I do not accuse Sigma of plagiarism in this instance, I cannot conscientiously acquit him of it in another line of that reply. Before directing your attention to it, permit me to express my admiration of the celerity with which that reply followed my letter. Under the circumstances, it must be regarded as a miracle of rapid composition. For it is not to be supposed that my letter, which the editor of the Transcript refused, though three days in his custody, was ever out of his hands or communicated to any third person. The only parallel that occurs to me is to be found in *The Review, or the Wags of Windsor*. As I remember the scene, (I have not seen it since poor dear Finn's time') Looney McTwolter, the Irishman, enters on one side with a letter from the Captain to Grace Gaylove and is met by John Lump, the Yorkshireman, with one from the lady to him, John asks Looney what he has in his hands!

"*Looney*—Isn't it a letther! See, it's all waxy, like a potato. It's for Miss Disgrace Gaylove, from my master, Captain Beagard.

Lump—From the Captain? Then I saves a walk. *Here be the answer!*"

I would also take this opportunity gratefully to acknowledge the moderation of Sigma in his triumph over me. He contents himself with simply saying, "I thought I had killed him." Killed! why, my good sir, I was *annihilated*! Like Barnum, "I was NOWHERE!" And I have n't been ANYWHERE, ever since!

But to the plagiarism. It is after all, as I find on verifying the quotation, one rather of thought than of expression. Let not Sigma be afflicted by the imputation. He shares it with authors whose society even he need not disdain. Has not Byron been accused of stealing from Wordsworth? Did not Mr. Farrier prove that Stern helped himself with both hands from old Burton and Bishop Hall? If you will believe the Rev. Mr Todd, there is not a good thing in Milton that he does not owe to some ancient or modern author. And I remember to have seen lately some book or essay which maintains that Shakspeare has but a handful of lines which are his own exclusive property. Why then, need Sigma blush at borrowing a sentiment from a fair member of that amiable family, to a youthful scion of which I have once already made a respectful allusion?

"I can truly say, I am sorry for him," says Sigma; "I pity your bad passions, Tilda," replied Miss Squeers; "but I bear no malice, I am above it."

But I must check my enthusiasm, and conclude with returning you, sir, my thanks for the space you have allowed me to consume.

Your obedient servant, E. Q.

THE PEACE CONGRESS—PROSPECTS OF THE CAUSE.

ALL the world is holiday-making. After four years of alternate railway crisis, famine, money panic and Red-Republicanism, the overworn mind of Europe feels a necessity for recreation and repose. Our countrymen, with their accustomed energy, are foremost in the great business of pleasure; the Continent, all but closed for two seasons against their invasions by fears of change and rumors of war, is now pronounced free from danger even to the weakest nerves; and more than usually vast has been the consequent migration which is now swelling the weekly returns of French railways, and repairing the broken fortunes of German inn-keepers.

Of all modes of holiday-making, the palm must surely be conceded to that which combines a dignified purpose with an agreeable relaxation, which contributes alike to the amusement of the tourist and the instruction of the world, and reconciles the sternest sages to the seductions of pleasure upon the pretext of disseminating wisdom. All these conditions have been fulfilled by the meeting of the Peace Congress, which has just taken place at Frankfort. The ultimate issue of the Peace movement is matter for future, perhaps very distant, history; the immediate result of their expedition to the members of the Congress must, at all events, have been much present gratification and enjoyment. Many years may probably elapse before COBDEN sits in triumph on the ruins of the Horse-guards; and more than a decade may pass away ere EMILE GIRARDIN has succeeded in suppressing the last of the French marshalls. It may be doubtful even whether the present generation will live to see the doctrines of ELIHU BURRITT entirely neutralising all those tendencies to armed sympathy and forcible annexation which now flourish in the model Republic. But no one can for a moment doubt that the great Free-trader, the eloquent Editor, and the enthusiastic Sage, have each and all passed a very pleasant, and by no means unprofitable, week, at the old Free-city on the Maine.

At first sight, indeed, there seems to be a somewhat audacious antithesis between the avowed purpose of the Congress, and the place and time selected for its assembling. A conclave of doctors, ready speakers and able editors, has gathered together to inaugurate an universal peace for the whole of Europe, in the very city where a similar conclave so lately failed in realising the union even of a portion of Germany. It proclaims the abolition of standing armies in a land where the bulk of the middle-classes regards the army as its bulwark against anarchy; and hails the approaching downfall of physical force and armed ruffianism within hearing of the songs of HECKER, and within sight of the graves of AUERSWALD and LICHNOWSKY. All this is true, but it is not the whole truth; it is equally true, and of auspicious omen, for the great cause advocated by the Congress, that in spite of all the madness and violence and wrong which, for the last two years, have been exhausting Europe, peace has remained unbroken by the calamity of a general war. With every exciting cause in the fullest activity; with a degree of general tumult in men's spirits, more vehement than has ever existed since the outbreak of the first French Revolution, we are yet living in that which the general language of history will designate as the thirty-fifth year of Peace. The strong good sense of the middle-class in the great European communities, under circumstances more adverse to peace than have ever, perhaps, co-existed in European history, has deliberately pronounced against war. The fires, indeed, of armed conflict have blazed in isolated districts with terrible intensity; but even the storm of revolution has failed to fan them into a general conflagration. This is a great fact—a fact which could only be true of an age like our own, in which unrestricted intercourse has been constantly tending to equalise the intelligence of society, and obliterate the prejudices of nations. It is a fact in which there is great instruction for the opponents, and great encouragement for the apostles, of peace.

The history, too, of Europe is with them. The silken diplomatists of the present day despise ELIHU BURRITT as a visionary dreamer. Even so, after their kind, did the iron barons of the past laugh to scorn that man of God who, in the middle of the twelfth century, first proclaimed the *Treuga Dei*, and denied the right of private warfare. But the right of private warfare has long since passed into the domains of antiquarianism and romance, leaving behind it no memento of its existence more striking than those crumbling towers, which, from the rocks of the Rhine, have just witnessed the gathering of the Peace-makers among the old battle-grounds of Gotz von Berlichingen.

Again, take the history of duelling: when Lord Herbert, of Cherbury, the pink of English chivalry, visited the Court of LOUIS XIII., he found the ladies lavishing all their smiles, not on any of the "curled darlings of the land," but on a little, stooping, grey-haired warrior, whose main title to their admiration was, that he had slain eighteen of his friends and acquaintances in as many different duels upon the most whimsical punctilios of, so called, honor. Even till a very recent period, on the other side of St. George's Channel, it was deemed the duty of a man to be ready, on the slightest shadow of provocation, at once "to draw his good broad sword, and leave the lazy sons of peace to settle the justice of his quarrel;" yet the race of the Fire-eaters is in our times almost as extinct as that of the Fire-worshippers; "Fighting Fitzgerald" has been superseded in the management of these "little affairs" by the "Friends of Peace;" and Sir LUCIUS O'TRIGGER has become a fossil character, preserved by the wit of SHERIDAN, in perpetual memory of a happily extinct species.

In all these facts, and many others that might be mentioned, there is much hope for the advocates of this great cause. Already, or we are mistaken, the time has gone by when the nations of Europe would permit their rulers, for the mere lust of conquest, to repeat the mad game of the CHARLESES and FREDERICKS of other days. The age of dynastic wars is at an end. The really difficult work that lies before the advocates of peace is to reconcile the abolition of standing armies with the just necessities of defence, or the encumbering exigencies of empire. To banish diplomacy from the European system, to procure a codification of international law, even to obtain a general assent to the pridciple of arbitration, might be a less difficult task than to devise the means of protecting the commerce of piratical seas without a fleet, or of upholding an Indian empire without an army. Far be it from us, however, to dash the ardor of a generous movement with the cold probabilities of criticism: all great triumphs have been won by the predominance of the hopeful over the despair of the timorous. "*Impossible!*" MIRABEAU used to exclaim; "*ne me dites jamais ce bete de mot:*" it is the true motto for all heroic workers. The man who carried Free-trade against the aristocracy of England is not one to be daunted by difficulty: our earnest trust is, that, in our children's day's, if not in ours, the cause he is now advocating may win a like triumph over the banded diplomacy of Europe.—*Weekly (London) News.*

DOUGLASS JERROLD.

A WRITER in *Figaro* gives the following personal details in a sketch of Douglass Jerrold, the novelist and wit:

"In calmly summing up the merits of Jerrold as a dramatist, it seems to us that he is deficient in construction and realization of genuine human beings. His great strength lies in the pungency of his dialogues; but no collection of conversations, however brilliant, can by any possibility pass for a drama, which ought to be the representation of life, or, as Shakspeare terms it, 'the mirror of nature.' Jerrold's conversation is highly spiced with sarcasm. He delights in retorts, which are seldom courteous. Some of them are very characteristic. We remember one evening, at a friend's house, he asked Mr. Macready if it was true that he had taken Drury Lane Theatre? Upon that actor's answering in the affirmative, and going on to state that he took it more for the benefit of the dramatic art than in the expectation of making any money himself, and that it would afford him very great pleasure to produce his plays, Jerrold broke out: 'Oh, come, Mr. Macready, none of your damned *grim* patronage for me, sir!'

"Some of his remarks are even more indefensible. Dining at sergeant Talfourd's table one day, the guests were amusing themselves by propounding conundrums. Jerrold gave this: 'Why is our worthy host's face like a druggist's sign?' After several guesses, Jerrold gave his solution: 'Because it is generally red, and always lit up after dark.' This allusion to the sergeant's glowing countenance, after a few glasses of wine, was considered by the present to be in very bad taste, perhaps almost as bad as our repeating it. Some of Jerrold's retorts have, however, a poetical justice, which secures to them the sympathy of the company. We remember at the Museum Club he administered in the sugared shape of a pretended apology, a gentle dose of physic to a most arrogant and conceited member, who had insulted many by his supercilious manners. Jerrold, one day, mistaking him for an acquaintance (to whom he bore considerable resemblance), patted him good-temperedly on the shoulder, saying, 'Well, my boy, how are you?' The dignity of this young sprig was so much hurt, that he complained to several of Mr. Jerrold's unauthorized familiarity. This getting to the savage author's ears, the next time he met the 'offended dignity,' he took a public opportunity of apologizing in the following terms: 'I have to ask your pardon, Mr. Smith, for my familiarity the other day; but I am somewhat near-sighted, and at the moment I mistook you for my friend Brown, but a narrower inspection convinces me that you are a devilish deal uglier than he. I sincerely ask both your pardons for my mistake!"

"Upon another occasion, being introduced to Mr. Wire, the Deputy Sheriff of London, who happens to be a very short, stout man, the caustic novelist said to the jolly little official: 'You say you are Wire, Sire, but I swear you look more like an *inch of a crow-bar*.' We do not give these instances as brilliant specimens of wit, but merely as a sample of his unfortunate fondness for sarcasm. We shall inflict only one more of these 'amiabilities' upon our readers. A young author, somewhat conceited on account of having persuaded one of those generous-hearted nondescripts, called publishers, to issue a religious work of his, entitled 'Schism and Repentance,' wrote to Jerrold, begging him to subscribe for a copy. The 'gentle Jerrold' wrote back that he might put him down for *Schism*, by all means, but he would advise him to keep *Repentance* for his publishers and readers!'

"In person, Jerrold is remarkably spare and diminutive. His face is sharp and angular, and the expression of his countenance is in admirable keeping with the general tone of his writings. His expressive gray eye seems a kind of protective policeman's lantern, to spy out the oppressions of society, and the patient endurance of the poor. He is considered the bitterest writer of the present time, and has been savagely attacked by certain critics for the one-sidedness of his views, and his indiscriminate invectives against the rich."

Mr. Jerrold has been somewhat unfortunate in his literary speculations. He is an admirable contributor, but a bad editor. He makes no allowance for the prejudices of anybody but himself, consequently he generally contrives to quarrel with his readers in an incredibly short space of time. He pursues his object too fiercely. Failure has attended his shilling Magazine and his weekly newspaper. Both had more abstract talent engaged upon them than any other periodicals of the day, and yet he was obliged to discontinue the magazine, and sell the newspaper. Such was his popularity with the working and middle classes, that he got the circulation of his paper up to eighteen thousand copies. An injudicious article upon the Queen, written under the fierceness of an impulse upon hearing something to the disadvantage of that illustrious lady, which he afterwards found out to be false, diminished its issue to ten thousand copies in three weeks; and when he sold it to the present proprietor and editor, F. G. Tomlins, its circulation was under six thousand copies.

"It is, however, as a contributor to "Punch," that he is in his most favorable aspect: here his clear, forcible, vindictive style tells with admirable effect upon the prominent follies of the day. Who has not roared over his "Claudle Lectures," or wept and laughed alternately over his "Story of a feather?" Yet even here his delight is in applying the caustic to sore parts of human nature. We may as well mention that even in his favorite arena of "Punch," he has had his failures. Such as "Mrs. Bibb's Baby," which, after a number or two, he was compelled to drop. As a speaker, he is very happy. Whenever he takes the chair, the whole table is sure to "be kept in a roar." With regard to his personal habits, he is fond of his glass, and delights in midnight discussions; he is, as Johnson says, a very "clubbable fellow." He will also help any one whom he thinks ill-used. His thriftless habits have, notwithstanding his large earnings, always kept him poor, and prevented him giving his mind that fair play which it ever requires to do its best.

He is a good husband, a fond farther, and, so far as the rest of his fellow creatures are concerned, a doer of good things, though a sayer of bitter ones. He is about fifty, and, shocking to add, a grandfather! We must not forget that he originated the Whittington Club, which promises to be very successful. It numbers among its members almost every man of note in English literature, and a considerable number of French and German savans. This had its rise from the Museum Club, a small but brotherly band of authors, poor and rich, who met there, as on common ground, to know each other, and to talk over the news of the day.

Among other eccentricities, Jerrold is a firm believer in the hydropathic treatment, and actually, in his own opinion, cured himself of a severe rheumatic fever by sleeping in waterbutts, wet sheets, and other amphibious tricks. We shall conclude this rough sketch of a believer in the water-cure, by giving Lamb's reply when one of its earliest advocates was claiming for some professor the merit of this wonderful discovery: "It is neither new nor wonderful, for it is as old as the Deluge, which, in my opinion, killed more than it cured!"

ON THE PRESS AND THE PUBLIC.

[A View of the Anonymous in Periodical Literature, by THACKERAY.]

MY rising young friend HITCHINGS, the author of "*Randolph the Robber*," "*The Murderers of May Fair*," and other romances, and one of the chief writers in the *Lictor* newspaper—a highly liberal, nay, seven-leagued boots professional journal, was discoursing with the writer of the present lines upon the queer decision to which the French Assembly has come, and which enforces a signature henceforth to all the leading articles in the French papers. As an act of Government, Hitchings said he thought the measure most absurd and tyrannous, but he was not sorry for it, as it would infallibly increase the importance of the profession of letters, to which we both belonged. The man of letters will no longer be the anonymous slave of the newspaper-press proprietor, Hitchings said; the man of letters will no longer be used and flung aside in his old days; he will be rewarded according to his merits, and have the chance of making himself a name. And then Hitchings spoke with great fervor regarding the depressed condition of literary men, and said the time was coming when their merits would get them their own.

On this latter subject, which is a favorite one with many gentlemen of our profession, I, for one, am confessedly incredulous. I am resolved not to consider myself a martyr. I never knew a man who had written a good book (unless, indeed, it were a Barrister with Attorneys), hurt his position in society by having done so. On the contrary, a clever writer, with decent manners and conduct, makes more friends than any other man. And I do not believe my friend Hitchings whether his name is affixed to one, twenty, or two thousand articles of his composition. But what would happen in England if such a regulation as that just passed in France were to become law; and the House of Commons omnipotent, which can shut up our parks for us, which can shut up our Post Office for us, which can do anything it will, should take a fancy to have the signature of every writer of a newspaper article?

Have they got any secret ledger at the *Times* in which the names of the writers of all the articles in that journal are written down? That would be a curious book to see. Articles in that paper have been attributed to every great man of the day: at one time it was said Brougham wrote regularly, at another Canning was a known contributor, at some other time it was Sir Robert Peel, Lord Aberdeen. It would be curious to see the real names. The Chancellor's or the Foreign Secretary's articles would most likely turn out to be written by Jones or Smith. I mean no disrespect to the latter, but the contrary—to be a writer for a newspaper requires more knowledge, genius, readiness, scholarship, than you want in Saint Stephen's. Compare a good leading-article and a speech in the House of Commons: compare a House of Commons orator with a writer, psha!

Would Jones or Smith, however, much profit by the publication of their names to their articles? That is doubtful. When the *Chronicle* or the *Times* speaks now, it is "we" who are speaking, we the Liberal Conservatives, we the Conservative Sceptics; when Jones signs the article, it is we no more, but Jones. It goes to the public with no authority. The public does not care very much what Jones' opinions are. They don't purchase the Jones organ any more—the paper droops; and, in fact, I can conceive nothing more wearisome than to see the names of Smith, Brown, Jones, Robinson, and so forth, written in capitals every day, day after day, under the various articles of the paper. The public would begin to cry out at the poverty of the literary dramatis personæ. We have had Brown twelve times this month it would say. That Robinson's name is always coming up—as soon as there is a finance question, or a foreign question, or what not, it is Smith who signs the article. Give us somebody else.

Thus Brown and Robinson would get a doubtful and precarious bread instead of the comfortable and regular engagement which they now have. The paper would not be what it is. It would be impossible to employ men on trial, and see what their talents were worth. Occasion is half a public writer's battle. To sit down in his study and compose an article that *might* be suitable, is a hard work for him: twice as hard as the real work; and yet, not the real work; which is to fight the battle at two hours' notice, at the given place and time. The debate is over at twelve o'clock at night, let us say. Mr. Editor looks round, and fixes on his man. "Now's your time, Captain Smith," says he, "charge the enemy, and rout them"—or "advance, Colonel Jones, with your column and charge."

Now there may be men who are Jones' or Robinson's superiors in intellect, and who—give them a week or ten days to prepare—would turn out such an article as neither of the two men named could ever have produced—that is very likely. I have often, for my part, said the most brilliant thing in the world, and one that would utterly upset that impudent Jenkins, whose confounded jokes and puns spare nobody—but then it has been three hours after Jenkins' pun, when I was walking home very likely—and so it is with writers; some of them possess the amazing gift of the impromptu, and can always be counted upon in a moment of necessity—whilst others, slower coaches or leaders, require to get all their heavy guns into position, and laboriously to fortify their camp, before they begin to fire.

Now, saying that Robinson is the fellow chiefly to be intrusted with the quick work of the paper, it would be a most unkind and unfair piece of tyranny on the newspaper proprietor to force him to publish Robinson's name as the author of all the articles d'occasion. You have no more right to call for this publicity from the newspaper owner, who sells you three yards of his printed fabric, than to demand from the linen draper, from what wholesale house he got his calico; who spun it; who owned the cotton, and who cropped it in America. It is the article, and not the name and pedigree of the artificer, which a newspaper or any other dealer has a right to sell to the public. If I get a letter (which Heaven forbid!) from Mr. Tapes, my attorney, I know it is not in Tapes' own hand writing; I know it is a clerk writes it—so, a newspaper is a composite work got up by many hireling hands, of whom it is necessary to know no other name than the printer's or proprietor's.

It is not to be denied that men of signal ability will write for years in papers and perish unknown—and in so far their lot is a hard one: and the chances of life are against them. It is hard upon a man, with whose work the whole town is ringing, that not a soul should know or care who is the author who so delights the public.

But, on the other hand, if your article is excellent, would you have had any great renown from it, supposing the paper had not published it? Would you have had a chance at all but for that paper? Suppose you had brought out that article on a broad sheet, who would have bought it? Did you ever hear of an unknown man making a fortune by a pamphlet?

Again, it may so happen to a literary man that the stipend which he receives from one publication is not sufficient to boil his family pot, and that he must write in some other quarter. If Brown writes articles in the daily papers, and articles in the weekly and monthly periodicals too, and signs the same, he surely weakens his force by extending his line. It would be better for him to write incognito, than to placard his name in so many quarters—as actors understand, who do not perform in too many pieces on the same night; and painters, who know that it is not worth their while to exhibit more than a certain number of pictures.

Besides, if to some men the want of publicity is an evil, to many others the privacy is most welcome. Many a young barrister is a public writer, for instance, to whose future prospects his fame as a literary man would give no possible aid, and whose intention it is to put away the pen, when the attorneys begin to find out his juridical merits. To such a man it would only be a misfortune to be known as a writer of leading articles. *His* battle for fame and fortune is to be made with other weapons than the pen. Then again, a man without ambition—and there are very many such sensible persons, or whose ambition does not go beyond his *pot au feu*, is happy to have the opportunity of quietly and honorably adding to his income: of occupying himself: of improving himself: of paying for Tom at college, or for Mamma's carriage—and what not. Take away this modest mask—force every man upon the public stage to appear with his name placarded, and we lose some of the best books, some of the best articles, some of the pleasantest wit that we have ever had.

On the whole, then, in this controversy I am against Hitchings; and although he insists upon it that he is a persecuted being, I do not believe it; and although he declares that I ought to consider myself trampled on by the world, I decline to admit that I am persecuted, and protest that it treats me and my brethren kindly in the main.—*Punch.*

BARON HUMBOLDT AND THE PEACE CONGRESS.

THE following letter from Baron Von Humboldt to the Peace Congress at Frankfort, did not arrive in time to be read at the meeting:

"TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE PEACE CONGRESS.

"I regret so much the more that my personal position and advanced age, which warns me to complete what works I have commenced, should hinder me from assisting at a meeting having so noble an aim in view, as it would have afforded me the gratification of coming into closer contact with so many men distinguished for talent and humanity. I have already verbally expressed this regret a few weeks ago, when I had the pleasure to see Messrs. Henry Richards, Elihu Burritt, and Visschers, and to converse with them on the probable influence which your society may hope to exercise.

"The general peace which our continent has now so long enjoyed, and the praiseworthy efforts of many Governments to avert the oft-threatening dangers of a general European war, prove that the ideas which so prominently occupy your minds are in accordance with the sentiments called forth and diffused by the increased culture of humanity. It is a useful enterprise to inspire such sentiments in the commonwealth by public conferences, and, at the same time, to point out the way through which wise and sincere Governments may, by fostering the progressive and legitimate development and perfectibility of free institutions, weaken the long-accumulated elements of animosity.

"How much mildness of manner and an improved order in the organisation of States have confined within narrower limits the wild outbursts of physical violence, may be seen by comparing the first middle ages with modern times. The whole history of the past shows that, under the protection of a superior power, a long-nourished yearning after a noble aim in the life of nations will at length find its consummation. Has not a disgraceful legislation conniving at, yea even encouraging, the infamous system of Slavery and the traffic in human beings, at least on our continent, and in the independent States of former Spanish America, yielded to the united efforts of the better part of mankind?

"We must not, then, relinquish the hope, that a path will open by which all hostile divisions and contracting jealousies will gradually disappear. The whole history of the world teaches, to use the expression of a statesman long departed, 'that the idea of humanity becomes, in the course of centuries, ever more visible, in a more enlarged acceptation, and proclaims its animating power.'

"Inspired with these hope and wishes, honored men, I beg to commend myself to your kind remembrance, and, &c. (Signed)

"ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT.

"Potsdam, August 20, 1850."

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

PROFESSOR Finney, the "revival" preacher, is in London, preaching to numerous audiences. The *British Banner* speaks warmly in praise of his success.

——THE GREATEST SLAVE DEALER IN THE WORLD. "Although De Souza embraced this occupation, he by no means disconnected himself from his position of a governor, whenever it become necessary to assume it upon any ground of policy with reference to the native s or others, but he conducted all his operations of trade with such undoubted and inflexible integrity, that he soon became sought as the medium of transacting all the business of the place; and though he began as an agent for the sale of slaves, he very soon acquired so much money, that he became himself a slave merchant, and, if alive now, is perhaps one of the richest men in the world: rich however as he may be, as it will be seen he certainly is, still his riches are of no service to him, for beyond the barter of negroes for gold and silver brought by the slavers from Cuba and the Brazils, he cannot employ it otherwise, excepting for the gratification of his personal taste, which is of a princely description, or upon his domestic requirements, which latter are very extensive, from the fact of his always entertaining at his table the captains of the slavers at anchor in the roads.

"It would be utterly useless for De Souza to send to Europ